

JAN. 21 1924

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, M.A., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*

L. WHISLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. E. S. CONWAY,
Litt.D., F.B.A.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*

Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D.,
F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXVII NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1923 Nos. 7, 8

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS ..	145	REVIEWS (continued):	
ON TRANSLATING GREEK TRAGEDY. G. M. COOKSON ..	146	Mattingly, <i>Coins of the Roman Empire</i> —I. J. G. C. ANDERSON ..	175
SOME NOTES ON THE GREAT BACCHYLIDES PAPHIUS. J. M. EDMONDS ..	148	Grose, <i>Catalogue of McClean Greek Coins</i> . F. GARDNER ..	177
THE RELIGION OF LUCRETIUS. J. MASSON ..	149	Broadhead, <i>Latin Prose Rhythm</i> . A. C. CLARK ..	178
NOTES ON DEMOSTHENES AND THE YOUNGER PLINY. D. S. ROBERTSON ..	152	Shotwell, <i>History of History</i> . E. W. V. CLIFTON ..	181
PROPERTIUS, CYNTHIA, AND AUGUSTUS. E. H. GODDARD ..	153	<i>Symbolae Arotoae</i> —I; <i>Sirena Philologica Upsalensis</i> . E. HARRISON ..	182
QUINTILIAN ON LATIN WORD-ORDER. H. DARNLEY NAYLOR ..	156	Lindsay, <i>Early Latin Verses</i> . E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN ..	183
ON STRABO XI. 8, 2 (p. 511). T. A. SINCLAIR ..	159	Jacks, <i>St. Basil and Greek Literature</i> (W. M. CALDER); Hall, <i>Caer Eboracae</i> ; Taylor, <i>Roman Villa at North Leigh</i> (J. A. PETCH); Schiaparelli, <i>Raccolta di Documenti Latini</i> (W. M. LINDSAY); Calder, <i>Togail na Tebe</i> (J. FRASER); Hoernle, <i>Problem of the Agamemnon, etc.</i> (AUSTIN SMYTH); Thomson, <i>Rhythm of Speech</i> (E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN); Hopfner, <i>Fontes Historiae Religiosae Aegyptiacae</i> (T. E. PEST); Drachmann, <i>Atheism in Pagan Antiquity</i> (W. R. HALLIDAY); Rouse, <i>Chanties in Greek and Latin</i> (J. BURNABY); Galdi, <i>L'Epitome etc.</i> (J. WIGHT DUFF); Arnaldi, <i>Le Idee ... di Tacito</i> (J. WIGHT DUFF); Wright, <i>The Arts in Greece</i> (P. GARDNER); Goetz, <i>Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum</i> (W. M. LINDSAY and J. F. MOUNTFORD); Rogers, <i>Ecclesiastical</i> ; Bolkestein, <i>Fabriken ... in Griechenland</i> (E. HARRISON) ..	185-193
ON STRABO XI. 8, 2 (p. 511). T. A. SINCLAIR ..	159	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS ..	193
LOCRIA. H. W. GARROD ..	161	CORRESPONDENCE ..	195
THE SPEAKING STONE. H. J. ROSE ..	162	BOOKS RECEIVED ..	198
Graffiti at Ostia. A. W. VAN BUREN ..	163		
'O <i>peyas</i> <i>Ilav</i> <i>rébryker</i> . A. D. NOCK ..	164		
Cleon and the Assembly. D. S. ROBERTSON ..	165		
Herodotus and Westermarck. H. J. ROSE ..	165		
A Noteworthy Survival. A. S. PHASE ..	165		
Aeschylus, <i>Septem c. Thebas</i> , 101-102. W. M. CALDER ..	166		
The Probable Error of a Water-clock. J. K. FOTHERINGHAM ..	166		
Note on Livy, 42, 33, 2. H. W. LITCHFIELD ..	167		
REVIEWS:			
Some Translations. A. D. GODLEY ..	167		
Halliday, <i>Growth of the City State</i> . J. L. MYRES ..	169		
Henderson, <i>Hadrian</i> . D. ATKINSON ..	170		
Boak, <i>History of Rome</i> . D. ATKINSON ..	171		
Platnauer, <i>Claudian</i> . J. P. POSTGATE ..	172		
Gsell, <i>Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie</i> . J. G. C. ANDERSON ..	174		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Double Numbers, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW 28s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. H. A. Ormerod, 46, Cliff Road, Hyde Park, Leeds; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford, and Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, St. John's College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. E. W. V. Clifton, 26, Danesbury Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Miss F. M. Rees, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss P. K. Downes, Redland High School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss C. E. Parker, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. M. Watson, Central Girls' School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. J. Whatmough, University College, Bangor; Miss Buckley, Simon Langton School for Girls, Canterbury; Miss D. J. L. Poole, 19, Banbury Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 6, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. A. B. Jeffries, 100, Cedar Road, Southampton; and Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter.

Nunc ipsum editi sunt hi catalogi
veterum librorum:

Catalogus XI. ephemeridum
annalium librorum, quibus agi-
tur de Græcorum et Romano-
rum litteris, palæographia,
historia, arte grammatica, con-
tinens librorum titulos fere
1800.

Catalogus XII. scriptorum
Græcorum continens librorum
titulos fere 2000.

Catalogus XIII. scriptorum
Latinorum continens librorum
titulos fere 2000.

Omnes hi catalogi gratis mittuntur
petentibus a:

Frommannsche Buchhandlung

WALTER BIEDERMANN,

Jena, Deutschland, Johannisstr. 6.

BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

MURRAY'S HANDY CLASSICAL MAPS

EDITED BY G. B. GRUNDY
M.A., D.LITT.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD

'These maps of Mr. Murray's are far better than anything which has yet been attempted in the direction of teaching the physical features of ancient geography, and they deserve all attention from students and schoolmasters.'

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY.

t and
upon
tional
(c) to
create

annual
of 50
edings
ssical
ssical
before
must

o the
seeds;
llege,
o the
ifton,
uden.
The
ham;
erton,
C. E.
ersity
atson,
Aber-
Simon
Road,
ffries,
xeter.

NS

DAD

BY
S

born
etter
ed in
tures
all

8

T
Lati
Scho
Hou
a ver
tion
Gran
or F
satio
there
readi
gave
inscr
fully
the R
Scho
in m
the
Gree
unive
some
Gree
plays
Scho
be pr
ber.
for r
Head
(Lan
M. F.
ingto
inform
A.R.I
Lond
discu
some

A c
A pe
in Gre
at the
Reader
mover
of the
Gardn
genero
arrang
costum

NO.

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1923

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

THE Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching held its annual Summer School in August (2 to 15) at Downe House, near Newbury. Dr. Rouse gave a very interesting course of demonstration lessons with boys from Newbury Grammar School who knew no Latin or French. Latin reading and conversation classes were diligently attended; there was even a small informal Greek reading circle. Mr. R. G. Collingwood gave an interesting lecture on Roman inscriptions in Britain, showing beautifully drawn copies. Professor Ure and the Headmaster of Newbury Grammar School lectured on the place of Greek in modern schools, the former urging the importance of even one year's Greek for students going to the newer universities. In the open-air theatre some scenes were given from Latin and Greek plays, as well as the topical Latin plays which are an annual feature of the School. A full report of the School will be printed in *Latin Teaching* for November. The President of the Association for 1923-24 is Mr. L. R. Strangeways, Headmaster of Bury Grammar School (Lancs.); the Hon. Secretary is Miss M. F. Moor, 45, High Street, Old Headington, Oxford, from whom further information may be obtained. The A.R.L.T. will be holding a meeting in London on January 9, 1924, and will discuss 'Problems in Latin Teaching: some Modern Solutions.'

A correspondent writes:

A performance of the *Birds* of Aristophanes in Greek was given at King's College, London, at the end of last June. Dr. Clara Knight, Reader in Classics at the College, was the prime mover and chief author (under Aristophanes) of the performance, and Professor Ernest Gardner, with Mrs. and Miss Gardner, were generous and indefatigable collaborators in the arrangement of all the scenery, setting, and costumes of the play. No one who saw the

play can fail to remember—and to remember as triumphs of art and archaeology—the costumes which they designed (and not only designed, but also executed) for hoopoe, flamingo, and every manner of bird, each according to its kind. And the scene before which the birds flapped their wings and said their parts and sang their songs, with its picture of the heavenly city in the clouds, is no less of a happy memory.

The burden of the play fell largely upon Mr. M. L. W. Laistner, who played the part of Peisthetairos as one to the manner born, with the gravity of profound conviction and the energy of a quick enthusiasm. He dominated the stage and controlled the action. His colleague, Mr. Pocock (of University College), in the part of Euelpides, caught the same vein and showed the same verve, *et respondere paratus*. Mr. Jacob, unforgettable in the part of the hoopoe, was a bird of shy dignity, with a modest droop of the eyes, pontifically serious when the action was *au grand sérieux*, but twinkling into humour when the chance came his way. The adventurers who came to offer their aid in the building of Nephelococcygia were all convincing adventurers. Mr. Randolph Hughes, with an Athenian versatility, played the part both of oracle-monger and of sycophant, with so clear a distinction between his two parts, alike in action and in voice, that only those who knew in advance that the same man was playing both could possibly have distinguished the sycophant from the oracle-monger. And as for the Chorus—well, one can only say, as one reflects on their twitterings (*τὸ τὸ τὸ τὸ*) and their excitements and the wheeling of their evolutions, 'ὁμέτερος ὁ πυραμοῦς—you take the cake.' Mr. Raeburn was an admirable leader. Parry's music set a key to which everything attuned itself naturally; and if the ear had its delight in clear enunciation and good music, the eye had also its delight in the costumes and the movements of the birds.

Many rehearsals had gone to the success of the play; and the conductor, Mr. Arthur Cowen, had laboured with a loyalty that commanded success upon the music. But there is a something in the performance of a Greek play which generally blesses performers and audience alike. Is it that both feel themselves initiates in a mystery which is hidden from the ununderstanding mass? Or is it that the players can fling themselves into Greek parts, just because they are in Greek, with a high magnificence which would desert them if they were speaking in the common English tongue? *Vix solvenda quaestio*; but at any rate one may say of all the performers, in the final words of the play itself, *τὴν ἐλλά καλλίνικοι*.

ON TRANSLATING GREEK TRAGEDY.

THEORETICALLY the true aim of translation is to transport us back to the poet, not to bring him closer to ourselves; it is we and not the poet or his work, already finished *hors concours*, that must undergo an essential change. And the aim so defined necessarily determines the method; in other words, the language of translation must, according to this theory, be used with the single purpose of creating the illusion of Greek tragic art come to life. Hence there must be no appeal to the national memory in which the poetry of the race is stored; the measures employed must be reminiscent only of the Greek. And in the result it is hoped to give a new *genre* to English literature, and to create the taste by which it shall be enjoyed.

The aim is high and proportionately difficult of accomplishment. Do we know the true effect of the iambic line or of the choric metres on a Greek ear? If we do, can we even approximately reproduce it? Clearly not; for we have nothing like the same richness in vowels, polysyllables and compound words. There is not one phrase or lyrical period where every detail can be re-arranged with the same incidence and made to preserve the same value. The structure of the two languages is fatal to the attempt.

But there is a further consideration. Every language consists of sounds capable of being organised into song, but song cannot be the same in any two languages, because the parts of which each is composed differ and cannot produce any harmony inconsistent with themselves.

Milton, of course, banned rhyme, or, as he correctly spelt it, 'rime,' as 'a fault avoided by the learned ancients,' and it may well be argued that in any attempt to render the classic modes into English the 'invention of a barbarous age' is especially out of place. But it remains true of the English lyric, as it is true of all French poetry, that 'la Rime est le moyen suprême d'expression, et l'imagination de la Rime le maître outil.' Furthermore, rhyme determines metre.

Therefore the unrhymed movements

of a Greek chorus, however felicitously imitated in English, are organised according to a technique appropriate to the one language but inconsistent with the metrical laws of the other, and the very elements of harmony are decomposed. To find a parallel to this method you must imagine an English lyric rendered into Greek in the same measure and with the same arrangement of rhymes. If that could be done we should have an example of the truth that in translation the more closely two things are forced into a formal and reluctant propinquity the more apparent becomes the distance that divides them. Sensuously you cannot hope to compete with the rich effects of Greek poetry if you throw away the indigenous wealth of your own; psychically the trammels of strange rhythm will fetter the imagination, with results on the reader as far as possible removed from the free play of emotion roused by the *ipsissima verba* in the Greek theatre. There will be no illusion, but rather the sense of a living language stretched on the rack, and in the torturing process not only the life of the drama but the soul of all poetry will be seen struggling in *extremis*.

This is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the too rigorous premiss from which we started; namely that the translator must carry us back to the Greek, and of the method that theory logically compels him to adopt. Still, it represents a real danger, never quite separable from this high and difficult aim.

Now let us look at the excluded alternative—bringing the poet nearer to ourselves. Its appropriate method is the free style associated with many great names that have lent their lustre to translation, from Chaucer to Shelley. Nevertheless it has its characteristic vice; a latitude of adaptation in which the original passes out of recognition; it is not therefore brought nearer to us; there can be no illusion, for none is attempted.

It appears, then, that there is no safety in extremes; and we must look for a compromise. That is to say, we must sometimes sacrifice the Greek to the English and sometimes the English

to the Greek: steering a more or less irregular and devious course between the two. But in practice it will be found that every translator, as there is more or less of the poet in him, leans inevitably, instinctively and consistently either to the one or to the other.

But there is something more to be said. It is of no great importance whether we deny the name of poet to a translator or not; but it will be conceded that the translation of a poem must have the characteristics of poetry; and we may draw from this what inference we please. Now the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* of a poem or of a line of poetry are a certain state of mind; and in proportion as this is or is not identical in poet and reader the work in its kind succeeds or fails. The translator, if it be possible, must feel as the poet felt and rouse the same feelings in those who read his translation. This too is a sufficiently difficult aim.

There is probably not one Greek word that you can match, hue for hue and weight for weight, in English; for language is not a crystallised thing, but a living, sensitive organism, animated by the spirit of the race and of the individual man, adapted to their characteristic purposes, changing as they change, saturated with history. No mind can make itself an absolutely transparent medium through which the mind of another shall be discerned; the authentic word that clothes thought necessarily veils it. So that between the personality of the tragedian and a page of translation there is interposed, besides twenty centuries of revolution and change, the language of the poet and its metrical laws; next, the mind of the translator; and finally the new vehicle of expression with its appropriate principles of harmony. It is obvious that in the process of transference so volatile an essence as poetry is apt to escape or undergo chemical change. And yet the psychological effect must be produced by this or that bias natural to the genius of the translator, and wherever niceties of resemblance stand in the way they must be sacrificed to the supreme end. It must be said of the translator, as it is said of the inspired teacher, that the mind of the

master dwells in him; that he has received the word, but not *δέκην ἀγγείου*; he is not the mere pool that reflects a star; its splendour penetrates him, and is regenerated, with a lesser glow, but in the heat of his soul.

The translator, then, whatever his method may be, is a revivalist; and, strictly speaking, nothing can be made to live its life over again. We cannot, for example, revive village life because the spirit that animated it is dead, and the attempt has a spectral quality, falsely related to the world of to-day. But it is not so with Greek art and Greek life. We are attracted to the Greeks because of their conspicuous power over the fluctuant and unstable elements of existence. It is this that gives their art its triumphant beauty, as if the creative forces had there and then done their best for the world; as perhaps there is in an orchard but one richest plot where grows the stateliest tree, one incomparable fruit, one perfect hour in the ripening year. It is this, exhibited in the great Greek examples of hard, honest thinking and right living, which gives an imperishable value to their philosophy of life. We see with increasing clearness that their past has by no means exhausted its virtue, and that many of the vices, literary and other, of our time come under the condemnation of their saner code; and in the general *malaise*, proceeding from an inveterate unsoundness, from many false steps and misunderstandings of what makes for happiness, we turn away from an environment, to which the soul strives to adapt itself with increasing difficulty, back towards a world where, illusively or not, the spirit of man seems to have made itself more at home; where, at least, the dust has settled and the atmosphere become clear. If there be now a classical renaissance, a new curiosity about that old civilisation, it is nothing that we call academic; it is part of the movement of our world. The translator reflects that movement; he responds to the stimulus of that curious unrest, that unsatisfied desire for calm, and gives it concrete expression. He is moved by the *πόθος τῶν τότε*; he has seen the *ὁμοίωμα τῶν ἐκεῖ*

and is filled with amazement; and if the divine madness be not his he incurs the *μανίας δόξα* by offering his translation as a sacrifice to the beloved.

Herein lies his spiritual, and, by implication, his artistic significance and his justification. If there can be no substitute for the Greek, neither can

there be any substitute for translation, and the method of it must be determined by the largest interpretation of its aim. For it is not too much to say that the work of the translator will only have attained its full scope when its influence is felt and seen in modern life and modern poetry.

G. M. COOKSON.

SOME NOTES ON THE GREAT BACCHYLIDES PAPYRUS.¹

THE devoted labours of Kenyon and Blass in restoring this MS. have left little for others to do except to check their results. Still, when in the summer of 1921 I made a careful examination of the whole papyrus, besides some minor defects in the mounting²—an art not so well understood in 1897 as it is to-day—I found that a few small pieces had been wrongly placed, and others, which really belong to extant fragments, incorrectly ascribed to lost columns. The new identifications are partly due to the expert skill of Mr. C. Lamacraft; all have been made in agreement with Mr. H. I. Bell.

Fr. 29 (Kenyon), which contains the word *ἐκατι*, belongs not, as Süss thinks,³ to a column lost between cols. 21 and 23, but to the end of the first line of col. 13 (*Ode* VII. l. 4); and fr. 33, [*υβρ*], placed doubtfully by Süss with fr. 7, follows [*βαρ*] (*sic lege*), near the beginning of the same line. I would suggest the following restoration of ll. 1-7 of this ode:⁴

*Ω λιπαρὰ θύγατερ Χρόνου τε κ[αί]
Νυκτός, σὲ πεντήκοντα μ[ήνες, Ἀμέρα,
ἐκκαίδεκάταν ἐν Ὀλυμπ[ία κελεύον-]
[σιν] βαρυβρ[όμοιο Ζηρός] ἐκατι
5 [ἐ]π[ρ]ὸς αἶμα[σί]ας κλειενῶς
κρίνειν τα[χυτὰ<τά> τε] λαιψηρῶν
ποδῶν
[Ἐ]λλασι καὶ γυ[ίων ἀ]ρισταλκὲς
σθένος.⁵

'Thou radiant Daughter of Time and Night, fifty months command thee,

¹ British Museum Pap. 733.

² E.g. the obscuring of letter-traces through the turning back of tiny portions of the surface; these and other small blemishes have now (1922) been removed.

³ *Bacchylidis Carmina*, Teubner, 1912.

⁴ L. 6 is due to Platt; l. 7 to Kenyon.

⁵ Of the Altis.

Day that art sixteenth at Olympia, by favour of deep-rumbling Zeus to judge for Greece within a far-famed wall⁵ both speed of nimble foot and eminent might of limb.'

Fr. 35, [*προξεν*], placed by Blass at the end of the first line of col. 15 (= VIII. 20), really belongs above [*σιωταν*] in col. 16 (= VIII. 76), a passage where I suggest, *exempli gratia*, the following restoration:

[γῦν δὲ καὶ κλε]ινὰν βροτο[ίς]
75 [ἴνα τεῶν με]λέων
[εὐαγορεῦντα] πρόξεν[ον,
[Αὐτόμηδες, να]σιώταν
[ἦκ' ἀερίφθογγο]ν ὕμνον,
[ὅς κτλ.⁶

'And now also, to champion in fair speech the strength of thy limbs, Automedes, have I sent a voice-rousing island hymn which,' etc. For the rhythm of l. 77 cf. l. 25, with which it corresponds.

Fr. 30, [*ισ*], which Süss proposes to assign to a column lost between cols. 21 and 23, belongs to the word *ἔργοις* in col. 28 (= XII. 203).

A fragment containing [*μ*] and, four lines below it, [*υ*], which I do not find recorded by Kenyon⁷, belongs to the end of ll. 1 and 5 of *Ode* XIII. (= col. 29).

Another apparently unrecorded fragment,⁷ [*ικφ*], and below it [*ικου*], belongs to XIII. 22-3.

⁶ All left-hand and medial supplements are checked by the tracing of letter-groups. The last syllable of *ταχυτάτα* (VII. 6) must have been lost by haplography. VIII. 77 suggested by Blass.

⁷ One of these is perhaps the third of the three added fragments mentioned by Blass ap. Süss, p. v; for the first and second see Kenyon, p. xvi.

The following fragments seem to have been placed wrongly in the current texts, but their true position has yet to be found :—

Fr. 14, which is to be read [λμο[or [αμο[, and under it [ανθι[, and under that [λινει[or [λινσι[or [λινου[, can hardly precede fr. 6, l. 4¹ (= *Odæ* I. l. 7, Blass and Süss; p. 437. l. 7, Jebb). Blass was apparently misled by the appropriateness of γαίης Ἰσθμίας | [όφθα]λμο[ν into making the traces below [λμο[into the αμ of γαμβρόν. But Mr. Bell agrees that this is an

impossible reading of them. The condition of the papyrus in the two fragments does not support the junction. And it is just worth noting that, given the junction, I find it impossible to make any sense of λινου, λινει, or λινσι in the next line, however the passage be restored.

Fr. 9, [κτιος κεαρ[, to judge by the condition of the papyrus, can hardly be part of XIV. 23.²

J. M. EDMONDS.

Cambridge.

² For other new readings I may refer the reader to *Lyra Graeca*, vol. iii.

¹ Now mounted as col. A.

THE RELIGION OF LUCRETIIUS.

PROBABLY no system of thought offers stronger inconsistencies and contradictions than does Epicureanism, and nowhere are the difficulties greater than in its so-called 'theology.'

Mr. Cyril Bailey, known as a scholar of broad and vigorous type, read before the Classical Association in January, 1922, a very interesting paper on 'The Religion of Lucretius.' He has made an independent attempt to grasp that most difficult subject.

I. He commences by discussing the ingenious theory of the constitution of the Epicurean gods as developed by Scott and Giussani, which he thinks 'the most probable solution' of the problem. I can only say in passing that this curious theory is rejected by most scholars as conflicting with Epicurean science, while such authorities as Munro and Eduard Zeller do not name it. Philippson, in his long and able article 'On the Epicurean Doctrine of the Gods,'¹ expressly rejects it. Professor H. Diels says: 'The Lachelier-Scott conception of the corporeal substance of the Gods is not merely improbable but impossible.'²

Both the writers just quoted tend to lay too much stress on the evidence of Philodemus. His treatise 'On the Gods' (formerly entitled 'On Piety')

has come down to us in so mutilated a form that even the learning and acuteness of Diels cannot now construct out of its fragments a reliable text. Philippson's paper is the fruit of close study and much ingenuity, but his very careful interpretation of Epicurean terms must be received with caution. In the puzzling phrase φανταστικάι ἐπιβολαὶ τῆς διανοίας, is he right to interpret διάνοια as 'imagination?' Plato (*Rep.* 511 D) defines it as 'the habit of mind which is concerned with mathematics and such sciences,' and contrasts it with νοῦς. All through the *Nicomachean Ethics* διάνοια has the meaning 'intellect.' Does Epicurus hold that imagination is required in order to produce from the mind-images of the gods a perception of the Divine? Surely not. Perhaps Wallace comes nearest to the actual meaning when he says, 'The mind leaps out to meet the sensation and turns it into an intelligent perception.'³ In Epicurus's letter to Herodotus at the beginning and close of § 49, we have ὁρᾶν καὶ διανοεῖσθαι and τὴν ὄψιν ἢ τὴν διάνοιαν, which Gabriel Cobet renders *intueri atque cogitare* and *in aciem aut mentem*. Here the evident meaning is 'perceive' and 'perception.'

Some Epicurean added to his master's three criteria of truth and reality a fourth, namely the φανταστικάι ἐπι-

¹ In *Hermes*, vol. 51, for 1916, p. 604.

² In his edition of Philodemus 'On the Gods' (*Transactions of the Berlin Royal Academy for* 1915 and 1916. See the latter, vol. 6, p. 29).

³ *Epicureanism*, p. 224.

βολαὶ τῆς διανοίας, Diog. Laert. X. 31 (Epicurus himself uses the phrase, slightly otherwise worded, at X. 50). No one has yet explained the *exact technical meaning* of φανταστικά here. No writer is more lucid and perspicuous than Lucretius, but in this case his *animi iactus liber* at II. 1047 (rendered by Munro, 'the mind's immission [?] reaches in free and unembarrassed flight'), followed by Cicero, *se iniciens animus et intendens* (*De N. Deorum*, i. 54), seems a vague paraphrase of the Epicurean phrase. Wallace refers it, it would seem justly, to the Divine mind-images. 'Epicurus,' he says, 'recognises this avenue of ideas solely on account of its theological bearing' (*Epicureanism*, pp. 224-6). Mr. Bailey states the aim of this doctrine very forcibly. In order to explain the efficacy of the Divine *idola*, Epicurus, he says, 'invented a special capacity of the mind (ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας) almost for the sole purpose of immediately apprehending the images of the Divine beings.'

Philippson has rightly emphasised the sharp distinction drawn by Epicurus between the fact of our perception by the senses, and that of mental perception, while at the same time Epicurus assumes the method of the two processes to be identical. Before we can see, a continuous stream of images flowing towards the eye from the object is required. Mental perception, on the other hand, is produced 'by a single image with a single stroke':

facile uno commovet ictu
quaelibet una animum nobis subtilis
imago (IV. 746-7).

It requires to be clearly understood that Epicurus supposes 'mental perception,' that is vision by the mind, to occur only in the case of the Divine images and of those other (sometimes compound) images which are seen in dreams or in mental ailment. The belief in apparitions of the dead or of persons at a distance was a stumbling-block to the Epicurean, which had to be accounted for in some way. Lucretius refers twice to such phantoms in connection with this subject (at I. 132-4, IV. 37-9).

It would be interesting to know if Philodemus or any other ancient writer on Epicureanism refers to mental perception as produced by a single image; the passage cited by Philippson from Diog. Laert. X. 48 gives no evidence whatever for such a conclusion.

After elaborating his distinction between mind-vision and sense-vision, Lucretius sets it completely at naught by basing his explanation of dreaming on the assumption that material objects can throw off both mind-images and sense-images, as when we dream of battles, feasts, processions, and so on. In his bit of special pleading (IV. 722-748), Lucretius explains that the image of the Centaur seen in sleep is produced by ordinary images of a horse and a man meeting in the air and adhering to each other. But he has just said that such images, thrown off from material objects, are too heavy to affect the mind, which requires images that are far thinner in texture than those which cause sight, 'since,' he adds, 'the latter enter in through the porous parts of the body and stir up the fine nature of the mind within and provoke perception.' But if the nature of the gods is so fine that their images 'can with difficulty be discerned by the thought of the mind' (V. 148-9), how can the gross ones sent off by a horse and a man be mentally perceived? Manifestly Lucretius contradicts himself here. (Those images which accompany every process of thinking are assumed by Epicurus to be called up within the mind by memory.)

II. From Epicurus's 'theology' Mr. Bailey passes on to his religion as it takes shape in Lucretius's poem. He quotes vi. 68-78, where Lucretius tells how, if men believe that the gods can be angry with them and have power to do them harm, they lose the peace of soul which comes from receiving the Divine images in tranquillity. 'This is a thought,' he adds, 'which might almost come from some Christian mystic.' 'With our mortal eye on them we may so model our own conduct that we too may attain to perfect peace of mind. . . . The gods, then, are our example, and the true *pietas* is to imitate them and to contemplate all things with a mind at rest.'

Thus the gods, 'who live themselves in perfect tranquillity, can instil their own peace by means of their images into the soul of man, prepared by its own freedom from trouble to receive them. *This is at least a very deeply religious conception*, and who shall say that this "atheist" has not penetrated to a truer notion of what religion might be than the orthodox belief in petition and answer?'

Mr. Bailey speaks of the 'nobility of the conception of the Epicurean gods' existence.' One asks, What kind of deities are these whose influence can so ennoble man? They do nothing, they help none, they love none, they do not know what goes on upon earth, and yet they are perfectly happy, ever saying to themselves, *Mihi pulchre est!* What influence of good could come from the contemplation of such deities as these? The 'peace' which they could instil does not deserve the name. Such deities could have no religious value, no power over the heart and conscience of man.

In the course of a very judicious and appreciative notice of Dr. Warde Fowler's great book on Roman Religion (*Class. Rev.* for 1911), Mr. Bailey says that that scholar 'has hardly allowed enough for the really religious conception of the gods as the realised ideal of Epicurean morality.' This is not even just to Epicurus. There is in his ethic a very high tone of morality: he calls for a profound helpfulness to others, a helpfulness which is itself a necessity for the happiness of the helper, and for severe temperance and self-denial, qualities which put to shame his 'gods' in their idle Heaven. The ordinary human being of the higher races has, throughout the ages, with few exceptions, demanded in his idea of 'the Divine' exhaustless, ever-working power,¹ the taking of a side with good against evil and deep sympathy with human beings. On the other hand, the first of Epicurus's 'Articles of Faith' runs: 'The Blessed and Incorruptible nature neither has trouble of his own nor causes trouble to others.'

How childish is the notion that can associate Divine action in any way with 'trouble'! No reverent human spirit ever conceived such a thought.

With regard to the lines quoted above (vi. 68-78), Dr. Fowler says: 'This passage is the nearest approach to real religion that we find in the history of Roman Epicurism, yet so far as we know it bore no fruit,' for, as he goes on to say, 'according to Epicurus the Power manifesting itself in the universe is not a Divine Power but a mechanical one: the gods have nothing to do with it.' At times the Epicurean within the poet's own personality overmasters both the thinker and the man. He forgets that it is not superstitious fears alone which close the soul to the influx of the Divine.

III. Whether from one quarter or from another, Lucretius seems fated to be misunderstood. A very able writer to whom we owe our most reliable treatise on the philosophy of Schopenhauer, Professor William Caldwell, has attempted to explain the strange (it has been called 'portentous') personality of the poet from his heredity as a Roman. He says:

'Lucretius thinks of the main service of philosophy as consisting in the power of emancipating the human mind from superstition. All this is quite typical of the essentially practical nature of the Roman character, of its conception of education as in the main discipline and duty, of its distrust of Greek intellectualism, and of its preoccupation with the necessities of the struggle for existence and for government, of its lack of leisure and so on.'²

Does any one of these conceptions express what the name of 'Lucretius' stands for, unless it be the aim to deliver men from superstition; but is this aim less paramount in Epicurus's system, or does he preach it one whit less passionately than does the Roman poet? As to the 'lack of leisure,' does not Epicurus's famous maxim *λάθε βιώσας*, 'Hide your life,' simply ignore 'the struggle for existence,' and the ambition which was central to the Roman character? Epicurus postu-

¹ Passivity is as discordant with the idea of God as is feebleness.

² *Pragmatism and Idealism*, 1913, p. 119.

lated leisure more than any other teacher has done; to him it was the main necessity of life, whereas to the Roman riches, power and victory in war were the things that matter. As to 'education' again, it was Epicurus himself who scoffed at culture and held all *Μουσική* to be 'unprofitable and idle.' The average Roman might indeed 'distrust Greek intellectualism,' but the Epicurean's rejection of metaphysics, of all except what our senses tell us, is something far more serious.

All this is no more valid than it would be to claim Lucretius's special poetic gift as due to his Roman heredity. There is much in Lucretius which is abnormal, and which can no more be explained from his Roman origin than could the strange, distorted temperament of another man of genius, Schopenhauer, born in the year before the French Revolution, be explained simply from the conditions of life and thought in that era.

JOHN MASSON.

NOTES ON DEMOSTHENES AND THE YOUNGER PLINY.

(1) DEMOSTHENES, *Pro Phormione* (XXXVI.) 8: ἀρπάζοντος δὲ τούτου καὶ πόλλ' ἀπὸ κοινῶν ὄντων τῶν χρημάτων ἀναλίσκειν οἰόμενον δεῖν, λογιζόμενοι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ ἐπίτροποι, ὅτι, εἰ δεήσει κατὰ τὰς διαθήκας, ὅσ' ἂν οὗτος ἐκ κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων ἀναλώσῃ, τούτοις ἐξελόντας ἀντιμοιρεῖ τὰ λοιπὰ νέμειν, οὐδ' οἷον ἔσται περιόν, νείμασθαι τὰ ὄνθ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς ἔγνωσαν.

(ἀντιμοιρεῖ S: ἀντιμοιρεῖ FQ: τὰς ἀντιμοιρίας A.)

ἀντιμοιρεῖ is a unique and suspicious form. Almost all adverbs of this type are compounds of ἀ-priv., νη-, παν-, or αὐτο-, and of these only αὐτοβοεῖ and πανδημεῖ seem to be common in classical prose (see Kühner-Blass, *Gr.Gr.* I. 2, p. 303; and cf. Paley and Sandys, *ad loc.*). Hence some editors follow A in reading τὰς ἀντιμοιρίας, a reading which has the advantage of supplying an object to ἐξελόντας, on which τούτοις can depend. But the reading of S calls for explanation.

I suggest that Demosthenes wrote τούτοις ἐξελόντας ἀντίμοιρ' εἶτα τὰ λοιπὰ νέμειν. The word ἀντίμοιρος is almost unknown, but most editors read it (for M's ἰσοτίμοιρον) in Aeschylus, *Choeph.* 320, σκότῳ φάος ἀντίμοιρον. A's τὰς ἀντιμοιρίας can be explained as a good gloss on ἀντίμοιρα.

(2) Demosthenes, *Adv. Polyclem* (L.) 36: λέγοντος δ' αὐτοῦ ταῦτα, ἀπεκρινάμεν αὐτῷ ὅτι σκευὴ μὲν διὰ τοῦτο οὐ λάβοιμι ἐκ τοῦ νεωρίου, 'ὅτι σὺ ἀδόκιμα ἐποίησας αὐτά.'

Apollodorus is describing a heated interview which he had at Thasos with

the defendant Polycles, his successor as trierarch, who was obstinately refusing to take over his ship. Polycles declared that Apollodorus' extravagance had embarrassed his colleagues and successors; and he absolutely refused to buy the ship's tackle, which was admittedly Apollodorus' private property. He pointed out that Apollodorus, had he chosen, could have drawn government tackle from the depôt. The sentence which I have quoted is Apollodorus' report of his own reply to this attack. Editors do not seem to find it difficult, but to me it is most obscure. How can Polycles be said to have ruined the tackle which Apollodorus might have drawn from the depôt? I see no answer, unless Polycles was (a) a dockyard official or (b) an immediately preceding trierarch. It is most unlikely that he held either position.

The difficulty is removed by the insertion of ἄν. The sentence then runs, ὅτι σὺ ἀδόκιμ' <ἄν> ἐποίησας αὐτά. 'Because you would so have ruined the tackle that the arsenal authorities would have refused to pass it when it came back to the depôt.' The state, Apollodorus implies, would have suffered, at least for a time; and Polycles could have made trouble for his predecessor by asserting that the damage was done before he took over the tackle. The answer is a gibe. Apollodorus does not press it, nor must we, for it is certain that at the date when he was fitting out his ship his individual successor was not yet chosen; nor was it then obvious that the ship would still be at sea when

Apollodorus' term of service expired. But the gibe was good enough for the occasion, and Apollodorus knew that the judges would applaud the man who had spared their pockets.

(3) Demosthenes, *Contra Cononem* (LIV.) 26.

Ariston here describes how Conon and his associates wasted time at the *δίαυτα* by various methods, including the putting in of irrelevant evidence: *καὶ γράφοντες μαρτυρίας οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑταίρας εἶναι παιδίον αὐτῷ τοῦτο καὶ πεπονθέναι τὰ καὶ τά.*

This is taken to mean that Conon put in evidence that his son Ctesias (whom he asserted to be the only person involved in the fight in which Ariston was hurt) was *illegitimate*, and that therefore he (Conon) was not legally responsible for Ctesias' actions. The subject of *πεπονθέναι τὰ καὶ τά* is variously explained as Conon or as Ctesias.

If the text is sound, it is difficult to see how else to take it; but this interpretation is not satisfactory. In the first place, the use of *παιδίον* of a grown man is odd: Demosthenes uses the word thirty times, never of an adult; and Plato's usage is the same. Secondly, had Conon really sworn that his son was a bastard, the respectable Ariston could scarcely have been content to dismiss the plea as 'irrelevant.' I suggest the transposition of *τοῦτο* and *καί*, reading *ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑταίρας εἶναι παιδίον αὐτῷ, καὶ τοῦτο πεπονθέναι τὰ καὶ τά*: 'that he (Ctesias) has a child by a *hetaira*, and that it has been treated in such-and-such a way.' The contemptuously allusive manner of the reference explains the vagueness of *αὐτῷ*. This reading fits well with Ariston's forecast of Conon's defence in chapter 14. 'He will say,' he declares, 'that Ctesias belongs to a Hell-Fire Club, *καὶ πολυλάκεις περὶ ἑταίρας καὶ εἰληφέναι καὶ*

δεδωκέναι πληγὰς, καὶ ταῦτ' εἶναι μένον ἀνθρώπων. ἡμᾶς δὲ πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς παρόνους μὲν τινὰς καὶ ὑβριστὰς κατασκευάσει, ἀγνώμονας δὲ καὶ πικροὺς.

I suggest that Conon's 'irrelevant' evidence went to show that Ariston had in some way injured a bastard child of Ctesias, and that this was represented as the real origin of the quarrel.

Mr. E. Harrison suggests to me as an alternative change *παιδίον αὐτῷ τὸ καὶ τὸ καὶ πεπονθέναι τὰ καὶ τά.*

Pliny, *Epist.* VIII. 23. 8, last sentence (the letter describes to Marcellinus Pliny's grief at the death of Junius Avitus): 'in tantis tormentis eram cum scriberem haec scriberem sola; neque enim nunc aliud aut cogitare aut loqui possum. uale.'

If the text is sound, this seems to mean: 'So great' (i.e. 'you know now how great') 'were my agonies when I wrote this, and wrote this only: this only, I say, for at this moment I can neither think nor speak of anything else.' But this is a most carefully worded letter and such slovenliness of phrasing is foreign to the context; it can scarcely be explained as due to the affectation of inarticulate grief. Moreover, Pliny is always polite. This letter contains no sort of allusion to the affairs of its recipient; it does not contain the words 'tu' or 'tuus,' nor one single verb in the second person, and Pliny was almost bound to apologise for this aloofness. The apology (with the MS. text) is slight and lame; all the emphasis is thrown on Pliny's own mental condition. But if <ut haec> be inserted after 'scriberem haec,' the whole sentence becomes a polite explanation of the deficiencies of the letter: 'in tantis tormentis eram cum scriberem haec <ut haec> scriberem sola: neque enim nunc aliud aut cogitare aut loqui possum. uale.'

D. S. ROBERTSON.

PROPERTIUS, CYNTHIA, AND AUGUSTUS.

WHAT Mommsen writes about the state of morality in Rome and Italy, when Julius founded the Empire, we must take as gospel truth; it is not even a highly coloured picture. The passage in Dio LIV. 16, which asserts that in

18 B.C., after all the years of civil war, the class of 'ingenui' in Rome numbered more males than females, implies an awful state of things, a general practice of female infanticide. Further proof can be found in Seck's *Geschichte des*

Untergangs der Antiken Welt, I. 5, and *Anhang*. Marriage was a burden undertaken from patriotic motives only, and the usual age for the girl was twelve to fourteen. It is certain, therefore, allowing even for the earlier age of maturity in Italy, that anything like sexual passion was out of the question. When the schoolgirl grew up, her husband had had enough of her. For him, love could only be satisfied with another man's wife or with an hetaira.

Propertius, who belonged to a family which had suffered much in the wars, had a conscientious objection to producing cannon-fodder and had renounced the usual public civil-service career. He had made up his mind very definitely to be the poet of love, and of a new kind of romantic love. He was not to drift into any sort of 'affaire' like Ovid or the others; he wished to find a mistress who would really be his muse and to whom he would be faithful, and whom he would repay by his poetry. The woman who captured him happened to be an expert on poetry; her fault was that she was too fond of luxury. Propertius was not a rich man, and could not afford to be extravagant in the carrying out of his schemes: he had rejected the bar and the civil service, and he had the usual recourse to a patron, whose function was obvious.

But give him the credit due to him. He was a brilliant young fellow, even if a little difficult, and a good marriage could have been easily negotiated for him. But he refused, and he refused for the sake of an ideal, the ideal of romantic love and poetry. This was not a Roman trait in the poet. The Romans were materialists, and so, not to marry wealth for the sake of an idea, and then to involve oneself with a sumptuous creature like Cynthia, was arrant folly. But Propertius kept to the course he had mapped out for himself for at least five years.

The amour started at latest in 30-29 B.C., before Augustus' first attempt at reform. Against the affair there was nothing to be said morally at that time, but much economically. What we have to find is, what it was legally. Before 28 B.C. she was his mistress, the relation-

ship being neither legal nor illegal. Then came 28 B.C., and the position of the lovers became doubtful, or at least Propertius thought so. What was the legislation, or the proposed legislation, of that year?

Usually it is considered that the law was one 'de maritandis ordinibus,' and that it contained a clause about 'infamia,' which applied to Cynthia, and which made marriage with her unthinkable. The poem II. 7 is taken to prove that she was 'infamis' according to the definition in the Lex Papia Poppaea of some time later. There could not be a wronger inference, and if she was 'infamis,' so were most of the women in Rome, with the result that marriage, instead of being encouraged, would have been rendered rarer still. People who quote the 'infamis' clause should quote in full with the explanation. The words are 'quae palam quaestum corpore facit fecerit,' and Ulpian (*Dig.* XXIII. 2. 43) expounds: 'palam' means 'sine dilectu'—i.e., without preference. 'A woman may give herself to one man or to more and may receive money, but she does not therefore come under the category: she must "vicem prostitutae sustinere," and if she does that, then she comes under the category even if she receives no money.' Further, if so, she would be one of those 'in quas stuprum non committitur,' and there never was a law which forbade commerce with such an one. But from Augustus' sixth consulate on, there was a law which prevented a man who had a wife from living in 'concubinatus' with another woman. He, however, legalised the state of 'concubinatus,' so that if a man who under the law ought to have married was summoned, he might plead that he lived in 'concubinatus,' and thus escape the penalty. (See Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, de stupro, 693. 2, and Pauly, s.v. concubinatus.)

If we remember how little is known of the actual legislation of that year, all this may seem very bold. But there is probably little doubt that the discussions of 28 B.C. included a law 'de adulteriis' as well as one 'de maritandis ordinibus.' This is clear from Horace III. 6. 21, where the various clauses of the later laws seem fore-

shadowed in a way which is impossible, unless there had been some actual talk or edict at the time of the writing of the ode, about 28 B.C. The important words are 'neque eligit' and 'sed iussa coram non sine conscio surgit marito.' This clause may have remained; the clause 'de maritandis ordinibus' had to be revoked because of the popular outcry, and it was this clause which had made the poet nervous.

The poem II. 7 proves, then, just the opposite of what it is usually taken to prove. Cynthia was not 'infamis,' and the question at issue was not that she could not marry, but that she would not. To marry his muse and to breed two or three little Roman soldiers for the Parthian wars—well, he escaped that fate and was glad of it; but there were other more indefinite dangers to be guarded against, and it was for that reason that he tied himself to Cynthia in legal 'concubinatus.'

Briefly, the trouble with the law, if it had been passed, would have been the children. It was no use marrying a woman unless children were to be the result of the marriage. Cynthia was very decidedly not a marrying woman, and her love for Propertius was not such as to make her accept the position of mother for his sake. She would resist and so would he, for, as he says at the end of the poem, his warfare is love, not arms, and the name of a successful lover was worth more to him than that of a successful father. The joy of the lovers was due to their being able to carry on more or less as before.

But only more or less. For, as has been said above, the lovers were scared and the 'lex de adulteriis' remained. The best plan for Propertius was clearly to legalise his status by promoting it from concubinage to concubinate. This status involved more than seems obvious at first sight, and clears up several difficulties which are otherwise unintelligible, in other parts of Propertius. If we bear in mind what Tacitus, *Ann.* III. 24, and Suet. *Nero* X., say about the laws of Augustus, the mention of the fact, at the end of Book III., after the break, and the news in IV. 7 that he is master of Cynthia's house, as well as the contract of III. 20,

may be understood, even though the explanation does not seem certain.

The man who lived in 'concubinatus' with a woman had a legal claim against her if she were unfaithful to him. Ulpian (*Dig.* XLVIII. 14. 5) says 'si uxor non fuerit in adulterio, concubina tamen fuit, iure quidem mariti accusare eam non poterit, quae uxor non fuit: iure tamen extranei accusationem instituere non prohibebitur, si modo ea sit quae in concubinatum se dando matronae nomen non amisit, ut puta quae patroni concubina fuit. Plane si iusta uxor fuit sive iniusta (i.e. a legal concubina) accusationem instituere vir poterit: nam ut Sex. Caecilius ait, haec lex ad omnia matrimonia pertinet. Et in ea uxore potest maritus adulterium vindicare quae vulgaris fuerit, quamvis, si vidua esset, impune in eam stuprum committeretur.' Further, *Dig.* XXV. 7. 3: 'nec adulterium ab ipso committitur, nam quia concubinatus per leges nomen assumpsit, extra legis poenam est.'

Therefore, if Propertius were living in concubinate with Cynthia and he found her unfaithful, he could bring an action for adultery against her, or he could force her to fidelity to him by threatening an action. The events that are relevant are as follows: He had his ideal about love poetry and a perpetual mistress; for a while, things went well enough, but soon they began to go wrong. Often they quarrelled, often they patched it up. Cynthia was flighty, self-willed, independent. In III. 20 is the last arrangement. Cynthia is getting on: she has just had a bad rebuff from some lover, and Propertius offers to marry her—i.e., to marry her in the only way conceivable to him. There is a whole ceremony described, a sort of poetic marriage, with *foedera, iura, pacta*, and so on. This almost certainly means a legal arrangement. In an ordinary marriage there was little ceremony, no registration, but there always was a settlement of the property brought in by the wife. It is so here. Propertius has ceased to be madly in love with Cynthia, but he made one more effort, not only to bind her to him, but to rouse his enthusiasm for her by a mystical ceremony which would im-

press the imagination. But then came the break; then came the detectives, the forerunners of the *delatores* who were the ruin of the Empire, set round her house; then came his quasi-denunciation of her as a prostitute, and then we find him owning her house. What had happened?

He had discovered her infidelity and used his rights to obtain damages from her. The punishment, according to Julius Paulus (*Sententiae*, II. 26. 14), was the loss of half the dower and a third of the property. Whether the case came to court it is impossible to say, but probably not. There are flaws, of course. IV. 5 is not a denunciation of Cynthia as a prostitute, but it is at least a gross 'iniuria' to Cynthia and certainly applies to her. We do not know the terms of the agreement in III. 20; but we do know that at the beginning he gave her no presents; that later he objected to her wanting little presents

from him; that he occasionally made use of her property—e.g., Lygdamus; that she seems throughout to have been the wealthier of the two; that she was past her prime; that the house was once hers, and later was his. The settlement was therefore a sort of 'fundus dotalis,' and on a breach of the agreement he became master of her house.

Treat Propertius well and he was full of romantic un-Roman ideas. Scratch him, and he became an old Puritan, who would take advantage of the law and regarded morality as nothing but keeping within the law. She had tried him severely; now she must take the consequences. There is an alternative—that after inheriting her house by will he denounced her as a prostitute; but it is not a certain alternative, for the chronology is not clear. In any case, the alternative is not pleasant.

E. H. GODDARD.

QUINTILIAN ON LATIN WORD-ORDER.

QUINTILIAN's teaching on order, like that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, is scanty and unsystematic. From time to time he falls into banality and silliness. For banality, compare his paragraphs on solecisms (I. 5. 38), where he thinks it worth while to classify such schoolboy errors as *nam enim, in Alexandriam, quoque ego, enim hoc uoluit, autem non habuit*. For silliness, read the reason he gives for putting in the first place what comes first in order of time (9. 4. 25). The passage is, doubtless, based on the naïve remarks of Dionysius, ch. 5, p. 100, l. 25 (Rhys Roberts), but the reason is all Quintilian's own.

At 9. 4. 23 he tells us to put the word of weaker sense before the stronger word—e.g. you must not call a man *sacrilegus* and then *fur*, but *vice versa*! Next he speaks of what he calls *naturalis ordo*, illustrating by *viros ac feminas, diem ac noctem, ortum et occasum*. At 9. 4. 24 he informs us that *quaedam ordine permutato fiunt superuacua, ut 'fratres gemini'; nam si 'gemini' praecesserint, 'fratres' addere non est necesse*. But neither Livy nor Cicero felt such scruples; for Livy (I. 24. 1)

has *trigemini fratres*, and Cicero (*De Div.* 2. 43. 90) *gemini fratres*, where 'twins' has special point. No doubt *fratres gemini*, like *fratris filius erat regis* (Livy 1. 38. 1) and *populus Romanus*, is a more or less fixed locution; but if a Roman wished to emphasise *gemini* or *Romanus*, there is no reason why he should not place either word in front of the noun. See Weissenborn-Müller on *Romanus sum civis* (Livy 2. 12. 9) and examples there referred to of *Romanus populus*, etc.

The next words of the paragraph are surprising: *illa nimia quorundam fuit observatio, ut uocabula uerbis, uerba rursus aduerbiis, nomina appositis et pronomini-bus essent priora; nam fit contra quoque non indecore*. First, as to the general sense: Quintilian says, apparently, that certain rules of order are extravagant, because they are broken with good effect. For him exceptions disprove the rule. But one at least of these rules is utterly untrue of Latin—viz. that 'verbs should precede adverbs.' The explanation, of course, is that Quintilian is again borrowing from Dionysius: this time from ch. 5, p. 100, l. 8 (Rhys Roberts), τὰ ῥήματα πρότερα τάττειν τῶν ἐπὶ ῥημά-

τῶν. The assertion too that 'nouns precede verbs' comes also from Dionysius (ch. 5, p. 98, l. 7), as well as that 'epithets should follow their substantives' (ch. 5, p. 102, l. 16). As Dionysius says that 'pronouns should precede appellatives,' one may suspect that Quintilian wrote, not *et pronominibus*, but *et pronomina nominibus essent priora*.

At 9. 4. 26 Quintilian tells us that, *si compositio patiatur*, the verb should come last: *in uerbis enim sermonis uis est*. He then proceeds to say that words must be fitted *quo congruunt maxime*, and introduces the simile, repeated at 8. 6. 62, of a structure built up by rough stones of varying size and shape. (This simile is adapted from Dionysius, ch. 6, p. 106, l. 2.) But he concludes (9. 4. 27) by remarking *felicissimus tamen sermo est, cui et rectus ordo et apta iunctura et cum his numerus apte cadens contigit*. No doubt; but what is *rectus ordo*? (Butler here translates by 'natural order,' and by 'straightforward order' at 8. 2. 22.) At 2. 5. 11 *sermo rectus* is contrasted with *sermo deflexus*, and seems to mean 'direct style,' as opposed to 'abnormal,' 'odd.' But we are still in the dark, and sadly need a distinct definition of *rectus*, as we do of *uitiosus* at 9. 4. 32, where Quintilian speaks of *uitiosa locatio uerborum* and *ordo uitiosus*.

At 9. 4. 28 Quintilian complains of *longae nimis transgressiones*, above all *in re tristi*. He quotes, by way of illustration, somewhat obscure fragments from Maecenas. The next section, however, is of greater interest: *saepe tamen est uehemens aliquis sensus in uerbo* (there is some considerable emphasis on a word), *quod si in media parte sententiae latet, transire intentionem et obscurari circumiacentibus solet, in clausula positum adsignatur auditori et infigitur, quale illud est Ciceronis, 'Vt tibi necesse esset in conspectu populi Romani nomere postridie.'* Then he adds, *Transfer hoc ultimum: minus ualebit*.

This is well; but who shall understand what Quintilian means when at 9. 4. 31 he says that Afer Domitius liked to 'harshen his rhythm' by transferring words *in clausulas*, and that it was solely for the sake of harshening the rhythm (*tantum asperandae compositionis gratia*) that he did so? Is

there anything wrong with *gratias agam continuo* or with *apud te iudicem periclitatur Laelia*? Afer presumably wished to emphasise the word abnormally placed. What may be the 'voluptuous and delicate rhythm' which Afer 'avoids' Quintilian does not explain.

The term 'hyperbaton' is defined at 8. 6. 62 as *uerbi transgressio*, and at 9. 3. 91 as *uerborum concinna transgressio* (the phrase is from Cic. *De Orat.* 3. 52. 201); but neither Cicero nor Quintilian gives a precise explanation of *concinna*. That the term 'hyperbaton' includes separation of words by a parenthesis is shown by Pliny in his letter to Tacitus, VIII. 7, and by Quintilian himself (8. 2. 15). At 8. 6. 65, after referring to examples of anastrophe (*mecum, quibus de rebus*, etc.), he gives a further definition of 'hyperbaton': *cum decoris gratia traicitur longius uerbum, proprie hyperbati tenet nomen*. But this is not enough. What is meant by *decor*? If there is transposition, from what norm is the departure made? And what are the limits of *longius*? Quintilian's example does not throw much light on these questions; it is the first line of Cicero's *Pro Cluentio*, '*animaduerti, iudices, omnem accusatoris orationem in duas diuisam esse partes*,' and he comments thus: *nam 'in duas partes diuisam esse' rectum erat, sed durum et incomptum*. I presume that *durum* refers to the spondaic (*du*)*ās pārtēs diuīs(am) ēsse*—i.e. six successive longs as against four in Cicero's order; but what would Quintilian have said of Caesar's *est omnis diuīs(a) in pārtēs trēs*—i.e. nine longs? It is hard to tell what Quintilian means by *incomptum*; perhaps the epithet differs little from *durum*. More interesting is the word *rectum*, which implies the recognition of a normal order. See further Quintilian's remarks at 9. 4. 68 and 9. 4. 70.

But no more need be said. Everybody knows that such hyperbata as *molestum adfert auxilium* are characteristic of all prose and all poetry. They doubtless originated from a desire to separate similar terminations; then the type became conventional, until even Vergil's *septem subiecta trioni*, which Quintilian next quotes, is not intolerable.

The topic of 'Ambiguities' is treated at 7. 9. 2-13. Quintilian begins with such trivialities as the ambiguous meaning of *gallus*, *Aiax*, *cerno*, and with other like puerilities. He quotes the well-worn ambiguities of *aio te*, *Aeacida*, *Romanos uincere posse*; and at 8. 2. 16, *Chremetem audiui percussisse Demean*. (In this later passage he cites the gem, *uisum a se hominem librum scribentem*, adding *nam etiamsi librum ab homine scribi patet* . . .—as if a man could be written by a book!) He next cites *Aen.* 1. 476, and, much to the surprise of Heyne, thinks it possible that *tamen* may go with *huic ceruixque comaeque trahuntur*. Then in § 8 he gives us *testamento quidam iussit poni statuam auream hastam tenentem*. This may do for a *controuersia*, but no real judge could find ambiguity: *statuam auream* are the words first heard, and, unless we pause, as Quintilian suggests we might (§ 11), after *statuam*, they mean one thing only—viz. 'a statue of gold.' One might plead that *auream* belongs by position to both *statuam* and *hastam*, and the plea would be reasonable. My only wonder is that Quintilian does not suggest as a possible meaning 'ordered a spear to be set up holding a statue of gold'—a silliness of which he shows himself capable at 8. 2. 16. Other examples are found in § 11, but, as they are not concerned with order, I omit them.

At 8. 2. 14 the sensible remark is made: *quare nec sit tam longus [sermo] ut eum prosequi non possit intentio nec traiectione uel ultra modum hyperbato finis eius differatur*; then is quoted, as an awful example of *mixtura uerborum*, l. 109 of *Aen.* 1.: *Saxa uocant Itali mediis quae in fluctibus aras*. The line is introduced during a fine description of a storm at sea. At first blush one feels that some stupid antiquarian has been busy, like the gentleman who improved on Horace, *Odes* 4. 4. 18. But the line may be defended on grounds both of taste and of order. The word *aras* implies more than a mere flat projection: it suggests blood and death to the victim. As for order, it should be observed that *mediis*, preposited and separated, has interest: the ship is not close to the shore, but on the high seas (cp. *Ecl.* 8. 59, *Georg.* 3. 237, *Aen.* 3. 665),

where rocks are least to be expected. Secondly, the group *mediis quae in fluctibus* qualifies both *saxa* and *aras*, and therefore, for the best of reasons, lies between them.

The next important topic is 'crescendo' (8. 4. 8). Quintilian says, *crescit oratio . . . cum . . . semper aliquid priore maius insequitur*. He then quotes Cic. *Phil.* 2. 25. 63 [*si inter cenam in ipsis tuis immanibus illis poculis hoc tibi accidisset, quis non turpe duceret?*] in *coetu uero populi Romani, negotium publicum gerens, magister equitum*, etc. The words in square brackets are not quoted at this point, and are misquoted at 8. 4. 10 as *si hoc tibi inter cenam*, etc. This order is quite ineffective in contrast to Cicero's, where the early position of *inter cenam* prepares us for the antithesis in *coetu*. But to return to Quintilian's comment. He writes: *singula incrementum habent. Per se deforme uel non in coetu uomere, in coetu etiam non populi, populi etiam non Romani, uel si nullum negotium ageret, uel si non publicum, uel si non magister equitum*. It is possible that the effect suggested by Quintilian might be achieved by pauses after *uero*, *populi*, and *negotium* (see his remark at 11. 3. 39); but, after all, the antitheses are (*inter cenam*): *in coetu*; (*comitum*): *populi Romani*; (*otium agens*): *negotium publicum gerens*; (*magister bibendi?*): *magister equitum*. It is true that the separation of *populi Romani* from *coetu* by *uero* may give stress to *populi Romani*, for the more frequent order (which Cicero uses four lines earlier) would be *in populi Romani coetu*. To emphasise *Romani* by making it preposited would be unusual, since *populus Romanus* is a stereotyped locution (but see on Livy 2. 12. 9, quoted above); nor does Cicero draw our attention especially to *publicum*, otherwise he would have placed it in front of the noun, as he does in *Pro Murena* 36. 76: *odit populus Romanus priuatam luxuriam, publicam magnificentiam diligit*.

At 8. 6. 40 Quintilian writes on the 'epithet.' He tells us that the poets employ it with special frequency and freedom, and then adds: *Namque illis satis est conuenire id uerbo cui apponitur; itaque et 'dentes albos' et 'umida uina' in iis non reprehendemus; apud oratorem, nisi aliquid efficitur, redundat*. Here

Qui
use
pres
11.
ness
vigo
glea
the
is f
desc
caed
from
effec
axes
wine
he w
ther
mar
cum
am
posi
tion
inst
simi
time
than
wor
man
whe
tion
how
ing
the
sona
sepa
swal
the
prob
wou
In
pari
Aen.
Fuci
te is
. . .
the
unda
is c

μα)
τους
καὶ ἰ
ὁρμηθ
Ζάκας

W
have

Quintilian charges poets with frequent use of otiose epithets. His first example, presumably, is from *Aen.* 7. 667 and 11. 681. In both passages the whiteness of the teeth implies strength and vigour in the animal; moreover, the gleam of the teeth adds to the terror of the head-dress. The phrase *umida uina* is from *Georg.* 3. 364. The poet is describing the cold of Scythia, and adds *caeduntque securibus umida uina*. So far from being otiose, *umida* comes as an effective parapsodokian: they cut with axes what is (normally) liquid—viz. wine. Had Quintilian quoted *Aen.* 5. 594 he would have had a better case. Vergil there writes: *delphinum similes qui per maria umida nando | Carpathium Libycumque secant [luduntque per undas]*. I am thankful that *umida* is not preposited. But there are several objections to the lines: *delphinum* is the only instance in Vergil of a genitive with *similis* (he uses the dative seventeen times); emphasis on gambolling rather than on swimming is required, and the words *luduntque per undas* are not in all manuscripts. Perhaps Servius is right when he sees in *maria umida* an imitation of ὑγρά κέλευθα; the imitation, however, is anything but happy. Conington compares *Aen.* 12. 476, where the swallow *nunc umida circa | stagna sonat*; but here *umida* is preposited and separated, and the sense is that the swallow, in search of insects, flits about the waters of the *stagna*. The time is probably spring; in summer the *stagna* would be dried up.

In speaking of antitheses and comparisons, Quintilian at 9. 3. 34 quotes *Aen.* 7. 759: *te nemus Angitiae, uitrea te Fucinus unda*. The slight trajectory of *te* is obviously *metri gratia*; but *uitrea* . . . *Fucinus unda* deserves comment: the ablative of description, *uitrea* . . . *unda*, surrounding the thing described is common in all poetry. Compare

Horace, *Odes* 3. 4. 54, *minaci Porphyryon statu*, and the note on *Odes* 3. 2. 32 in *Horace, Odes and Epodes: A Study in Poetic Word-Order*.

Quintilian deals briefly with good sound in arrangement of words at 8. 3. 16, and with avoidance of monotonous case-endings and rhythms at 4. 2. 118. He refers to breath-pauses at 11. 3. 39 and again at 9. 4. 68, where he cites once more *Pro Cluentio* 1. 1 (*animaduerti, iudices, omnem accusatoris orationem in duas diuisam esse partes*), first saying that the sentence 'should be pronounced without a halt for breath,' and then that the sentence falls into four groups (viz. *animaduerti, iudices; omnem accusatoris orationem; in duas; diuisam esse partes*), and that after each group we make a slight pause. If this is true, then inevitably *duas* has interest, and suggests such antitheses as *non tres, non quattuor*, etc.

The last and most peculiar comment on this much-quoted passage is found at 9. 4. 92, where he says that the rhythm of *animaduerti* is justified because 'partition' requires speed!

I have purposely left to the end one example of ambiguity mentioned by Quintilian at 7. 9. 8 because of the phrase *per flexum*. He there says that *quingenta ubi erant centum inde occidit Achilles* might be understood to mean, 'where there were fifty, Achilles slew one hundred' (!), and that the ambiguity '*fit per flexum*.' Butler translates 'by a mistaken inflexion of the voice'; but what we want is surely 'by a mistaken pause.' Is it possible that *flexus* acquired the sense of 'pause' from the meaning which, I venture to think, it bears at 10. 7. 11—viz. 'the jump from the end of one line to the beginning of the next,' while *transitus* signifies 'the jump from the bottom of one page to the top of the next'?

H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

ON STRABO XI. 8. 2 (p. 511).

μάλιστα δὲ γνώριμοι γέγονασιν τῶν νομάδων οἱ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀφελόμενοι τὴν Βακτριανήν, Ἀσιοὶ καὶ Πασιανοὶ καὶ Τόχαροι καὶ Σακάρανοι, καὶ ὀρηθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἱερέως τῆς κατὰ Σάκας καὶ Σογδιανούς, ἣν κατεῖχον Σάκαι.

WHO were the Τόχαροι, and what have they to do with 'Tocharisch, die

Sprache der Indoskythen,' as it is called by Sieg and Siegling (*Sitzungsberichte d. königl. preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, 1907)? Herodotus does not mention them. Pliny mentions together Tochari and Phuni as cannibals. Ptolemy (VI. 11) says they

were a μέγα ἔθνος on the banks of the Iaxartes. Ammianus Marcellinus (XXIII. 6. 37), chronicling the year A.D. 363, makes the Tochari supreme among the other tribes. There are a few other references to this people in classical literature, but they do not tell us much more. All we learn from this source is that they were the chief of the Scythian tribes who conquered the Greek kingdom of Bactria in the second century B.C.

From Chinese historians we learn that the people who conquered Bactria in the second century B.C. were called the Yue-Che, a people formerly (c. 200 B.C.) neighbours of the Chinese, but driven westward about 170 B.C. by another powerful people, the Hiong-Nu. Thus it seems that the Yue-Che are to be identified, if not with the Τόχαροι, at any rate with those Scythians who, Strabo tells us, crossed the Iaxartes and conquered Greek Bactria.

It is impossible, with the meagre evidence which we possess, to say with certainty what language these people spoke. Two suggestions are put forward: one, which was mentioned above, that they spoke Tocharish or Tokharian, or whatever name we give to that Indo-European *centum* language spoken at Kucha and Turfan down to the seventh century A.D.—Leumann called it simply *Sprache I.*; the other is that they spoke the Iranian language of Khotan (Leumann, *Sprache II.*), which we may call Khotanese, following Hoernle.

Charpentier (*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, 1917, pp. 347-388) takes the former view, and concludes that the Τόχαροι, otherwise the Yue-Che, the conquerors of Bactria, spoke the language of Kucha and Turfan, which we call Tocharish—the name given to it by F. W. K. Müller. But this language, as far as we can judge, was not spread over a wide area, and there are no traces of it in Bactria. Its two chief centres, Kucha, whose inhabitants spoke dialect B, and Turfan, where dialect A was used, are two towns on the slopes of the Celestial Mountains, a long way from Bactria and cut off from it by the North Imaus range. It seems to be confined to the neighbourhood of these two towns. But if it

were the language of the Τόχαροι, or Yue-Che, who moved across Central Asia to Bactria, we should expect to find traces of it more widely distributed. Now the other language, the Iranian dialect of Khotan, fulfils this condition admirably. Traces of it are found right across Central Asia in the very area through which we know that the Yue-Che passed. So it seems that perhaps after all the name Tocharish or Tokharian ought to have been given to the language of Khotan and not to the Keltic-like tongue of Kucha and Turfan.

There is, however, one fact which may justify the name Tocharish. The Turkish name for it was 'toçrı.' So in using the name Tocharish for one language, and Τόχαροι for a people who spoke quite a different tongue, we are perhaps not creating any more confusion than actually existed. It is quite possible that in Central Asia the same word (etymologically) meant a certain people and the language of a certain other people. A somewhat similar state of affairs exists in our own civilisation to-day, where *German*, *allemand*, *deutsch*, all refer to one language, while *Dutch* and *deutsch*, though one word, refer to two.

Charpentier (*loc. cit.*) has another interesting remark. He says that the Τόχαροι were Kelts. As we have seen, he regards the Τόχαροι as the speakers of Tocharish, and this we think is open to doubt. (See above and further Baron A. von Staël-Holstein in the *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, 1908, p. 1367.) Moreover, he regards it as proved on linguistic grounds that Tocharish is a member of the Keltic group of languages. This is also very doubtful. The differences between Keltic and Tocharish are numerous, and, I think, fundamental. Lastly, his explanations of the appearance before 200 B.C. of these Kelts on the borders of China are not altogether convincing.

'On a general survey,' he says, 'the Galatians, with the exception of isolated collections of mercenaries, do not seem to have gone outside the borders of Asia Minor. Proofs that they went farther are entirely wanting. But who will with certainty deny that, in the

con-
prev
sten
mig
reac
we
poss
such
of th
the
B
poin
Asia
Yue-
well-
on th
an in
of th
unkn
selve
Chin
penti
on to
eastw
more
ally i
that
separ
and

TH
(Λοκρ)
proba
naeus
and '
tells u
that th
and A
parent
terious
uncert
survivo
spoken
in loc
spoken
(Rhet.
certain
metre
Locrica
as the
of Sap
elsewh
used, a
ments,
NO. C

confused conditions which at this time prevailed in the East, not one group or stem of this warlike nomad people might have gone farther east and even reached Central Asia? Certainty here we unfortunately cannot aim at; the possibility or even the probability of such a wandering remains open in view of the periodic power of expansion of the Kelts right up to this time.'

But all this is a little beside the point. The Γαλάται only arrived in Asia Minor about 280 B.C., and the Yue-Che were already in 200 B.C. a well-established and powerful people on the borders of China. This leaves an incredibly short time for any section of the Galatians to cross Central Asia unknown to anybody, and make themselves a powerful neighbour to the Chinese and the Hiong-Nu. Charpentier realises this, and therefore goes on to say: 'The spreading of the Kelts eastward is probably an earlier and a more extensive thing than one is generally inclined to suppose,' and suggests that certain of the Kelts may have separated from the rest much earlier and reached Central Asia by going

north of the Black Sea. This is, of course, not historically attested, but from what we know of the habits of the Kelts it must be allowed that it is quite possible.

Charpentier, however, tries to prove too much. His case for the speakers of Tocharish being Kelts would be much stronger if he had not sought to identify the Τόχαροι with the speakers of Tocharish. It is quite arguable that the inhabitants of Kucha and Turfan were Kelts who came north of the Black Sea at an early date, but it seems much less likely that the Yue-Che should be Kelts.

The linguistic side of the question has not yet been thrashed out. It is not by any means certain that Tocharish is a Keltic language, and it is more than uncertain whether its speakers were Kelts. Lastly, it seems very improbable that the Τόχαροι, whom Strabo mentions here as the chief among the conquerors of Bactria, should be Kelts, or that they should be the speakers of Tocharish.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

University College,
Southampton.

LOCERICA.

THE *Locrica*, or 'Locrian Songs' (Λοκρικαὶ ᾠδαί), bore in antiquity—and probably deserved—a bad name. Athenaeus speaks of them as 'adulterous' and 'sultry' (καπνιώτερα, 697b); and tells us, upon the authority of Clearchus, that they were 'no better than Sappho and Anacreon' (639a). Their first parent was, perhaps, the rather mysterious Theano, a Locrian poetess of uncertain era. Two specimens of them survive, and in each the verses are spoken by a woman. Both are written in loose trochaics—a metre already spoken of by Aristotle as κορδακικώτερος (*Rhet.* III. 8, 4), and own brother, in certain of its types, to the Sotadean metre (Hephaestion XI. schol.). The *Locrica* perhaps look back to Theano as the Sotadeans to the major ionics of Sappho. As I have pointed out elsewhere, the major ionic metre is used, apart from its Hellenistic debasements, always by poetesses, never by

poets (*Classical Quarterly*, 1922, pp. 114-5).

In the time of Athenaeus a centre of 'Locrian' song was the region designated rather vaguely in antiquity as 'Phenicia.' One of the interlocutors in the *Deipnosophistae* is the Phenician Ulpian (who has been identified by some with the great jurist—there were Ulpians in Phenicia centuries after the time of Athenaeus). Ulpian wandered about Phenicia singing and collecting the Locrian songs, and one of them is preserved by Athenaeus, 697b-c. As it appears there in Kaibel's text, two of its lines are unmetrical. It is unmetrical as it stands in Bergk, *Carm. Pop.* 27; and Bergk's Apparatus records emendations neither convincing nor plausible. Wilamowitz, in his *Griechische Verskunst* (pp. 343-4), is hardly more satisfying than Kaibel. Yet the very slight corrections necessary to the restoration of sense and metre ought to have been

made long ago. I give the lines as I think they should be written:

ὦ τί πάσχεις; μὴ προδῶς ἄμμι', ἱκετεύω.
πρὶν μολεῖν καὶ κείνον, ἀνστῶ, μὴ κακὸν σέ
μέγα ποιήσῃ κάμει τήνδε δειλάκραν.
ἀμέρα καὶ δὴ· τὸ φῶς διὰ τὰς θυρίδας οὐκ εἰσέρῃς;
2. μολεῖν καὶ scripsi: καὶ μόλιν cod., ἀνστῶ scripsi:
ἀνιστῶ cod., σέ post κακὸν add. Bergh. 3. ποιήσῃ
κάμει Dindorf: ποιήσῃς καὶ με cod. τήνδε scripsi:
τὴν cod. 4. δὴ Bergh: ἤδη cod. εἰσέρῃς Meineke:
ἐκόρησ cod.

The first three lines are trochaic trimeters (3 catalectic), the last a trochaic tetrameter. *ἱκετεύω* in I is not more remarkable than *ἱκεσίου* πρὸς Ζηνὸς in Apollonius II. 215. Of Wilamowitz' 'iambic trimeters with choriambic anaclassis' I know not what to say.

Wilamowitz has placed beside this piece eight lines of a wall-inscription of the second century B.C. from Marisa, in Judaea. The lines are trochaic trimeters, but the few—and in most cases obvious—changes required to exhibit

them as such Wilamowitz has not made:

οὐκ ἔχω τί σοι πάθω ἢ τί χαρίσωμαι,
κῆρα κείμει μεθ' ἐτέρου, σέ μέγα φιλοῦσα;
ἀλλὰ ναὶ τὴν 'Αφροδίτην μέγα τι χαίρω,
δ<τ>τι σοῦ θοιμάτιον <ἐνθ> ἐνέχυρα κείται.
ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μὲν ἀποτρέχω, σοὶ δὲ καταλείπω
εὐρυχωρίην γ' ὅλην· πρᾶσ' ὅττι βούλῃ.
μὴ κρότει τὸ[ν] τοιχ<ι>ον· ψόφος ἐγγένει' ἄν.
ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν θυρ<ιδί>ων νεῦμ' εἰσικνέεται.

[] = *delenda*: < > = *supplenda*.

2. κῆρα κείμει scripsi: κατάκειμαι Inscr. 6. γ' ὅλην
scripsi: πολλήν Inscr. 7. κρότει scripsi: κρούει Inscr.
(the error arose from confusion of T and T);
ἐγγένει' ἄν scripsi: ἐγγίγεται Inscr. 8. νεῦμ' εἰσικ-
νέεται scripsi: νεῦμα σ' ἱκείται Inscr.

The lines clearly belong to the same species of composition as those preserved by Athenaeus, and the text of them would not seem to have been very deeply corrupted. Wilamowitz prefaces the many changes which he proposes by saying that he has no intention of restoring the text, and certainly he is far from doing so.

H. W. GARROD.

THE SPEAKING STONE.

THE following interesting epigram was discovered at Halikarnassos, and published by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and G. Karo in *Mitt. Ath.* XXXV. (1921, nominally 1920), p. 157:

— αὐδὴ τεχνήσσσα λίθο λέγε, τίς τοδ' [ἄγαλμα
στήσεν 'Απόλλωνος βωμὸν ἐπαγαλῶν;
— Παναμῆς υἱὸς Κασβώλλιος, εἰ μ' ἐπ[ὶ]στρόφους
ἐξεπεῖν, δεκάτην τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεῶι.

It was on the base of a bronze statue. The language, spelling, and lettering are all consistent with an early date; and a Panamyes, son of Kasbollis, is mentioned in an inscription of Halikarnassos earlier than B.C. 454/3 (see Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 45, l. 12 = Hicks and Hill, 27). It is therefore very probably of the early fifth century. The only other dialogue-epigram which is so early as this is *App. Plan.* (= *Anthol. Graec.* XVI., Didot edition) 23, ascribed to Simonides, which runs:

— εἰπὼν τίς τίνος ἐσσί, τίνος πατρίδος, τί δὲ νικῇ;
— Κασμῖλος Εὐαγόρου, Πύθια πύξ, Πύθιος.

This form, afterwards so popular in sepulchral inscriptions, was not apparently used for that purpose till considerably later—the late fourth or early third century (see D. M. Robinson,

Two New Epitaphs from Sardis, in *Anatolian Studies* pres. to Ramsay).

The editors confess themselves unable to find a parallel to the expression *αὐδὴ τεχνήσσσα λίθου*, which certainly is not very common, although one might suggest that Sophokles' *φωνὴ κερκίδος* (ap. Arist. *Poet.* 1454b, 36; fr. 522, Nauck) is similar. The famous saying, *ἐὰν οὔτοι σιωπήσουσιν, οἱ λίθοι κράξουσιν* (Luc. 19, 40), is quite different, being a strongly hyperbolic phrase (if not meant as a serious promise of a miracle), and referring to ordinary stones; whereas Sophokles and our epigrammatist are using an easily understood metaphor, the former probably speaking of the tapestry on which was embroidered the story of Philomela, the latter of the lettering on the block of stone. Two other inscriptions, however, give fairly exact parallels, though they are much later in date, indicating that the conceit gained some popularity, at least in Asia, and travelled far.

An epitaph found at Konia (Ikonion) in 1910, and published by Professor Calder in *Rev. de Philologie* XXXVI. (1912), p. 67, no. 36, begins:

Χαίρετε πάντες.

— λάρναξ αὐθέσσα, τί τ[ῶδ'] ὑπὸ σήματι κεύθεις;
— ἀνδράποδον θαλάμου τοῦ ποτε μουσουλίου.

This is of about the second century A.D. It has nothing corresponding to *τεχνήεσσα*; no doubt by that time the turn of phrase was too familiar to puzzle anyone. Another late inscription, from Sebastopolis, in Galatia (Kaibel, 402), while less successful in point of scansion, keeps closer to the phraseology of the Halikarnassian epigram:

γαῖά με τίκ[τ]εν ἄφωρος[ν] ἐν οὐρεσιν (sic) παρθέν[ο]ν
ἀγνήν,
ἠσυχὸν τὸ [π]άροιθεν (sic) νῦν αὐ[θ]έσσαν ἄπασιν,
σμυλγλίφοις τέχν[η]σιν κήρ' εἰπούσα¹ θανόντος.

The Galatian versifier's first line seems reminiscent of the 'Homeric' epitaph of Midas, *χαλκῇ παρθένος εἰμί κτε.* (literary evidence in Allen's edition of *Vita Homeri Herod.* 135, crit. note); this certainly continued to furnish

models at least in the region in which supposedly it was first erected (see the inscription of Utch-Eyük, published by Souter in *Class. Rev.*, 1896, p. 420, which embodies three lines of it in the epitaph of one Proklos). Has the writer distorted the phraseology to mean, not a statue of a virgin, but a virgin or unwrought stone? Kirchhoff was the first to see that the tomb itself, not the person buried (a *grammaticus*, Maximus by name), is supposed to be speaking.

Finally, the inscription of the thirteenth century (C.I.G. 8748, see Deissman, *Licht vom Osten*⁴, p. 251, n. 6) seems to combine a reference to the Biblical saying, already quoted, with the metaphor of the speaking stone which we have been discussing:

ἀν οἱ λ[ί]θοι κρ[ά]ζουσιν ἐκ [π]αραμύας,
πέμψον βοήν, [ἀφω]ρος ἀψυχος πέ[τ]ρα.

ἄφωρος is Moulton's conjecture, adopted by Deissmann.

H. J. ROSE.

GRAFFITI AT OSTIA.

WITH this peculiar class of epigraphical material, it is a not infrequent occurrence that the *editio princeps* is susceptible of improvement. The first five years of exposure to air and weather may make the letters more legible, as the second lustrum may witness the progressive disintegration or complete destruction of the layer of stucco on which they were incised. A recent visit to Ostia has given me occasion to study some of the interesting *graffiti* in the side rooms of the 'House of Jupiter and Ganymedes,' which were published by Dr. Calza in *Monumenti Antichi*, XXVI. (1920), columns 368-375. Two of the improved readings or interpretations are of consequence as modifying somewhat the views there expressed as to the uses to which these rooms were put, and one of the *graffiti*, the first which I shall discuss, has exceptional importance of its own.

Column 369, l. 19: The fourth character appears to be a ligature for KA. The inscription, VII. kal. Commodas, testifies to an extraordinary instance of imperial vanity or courtly adulation. This is described by a first-hand witness, Cassius Dio, LXXII. xv. 3, as follows, in his enumeration of the mad freaks originating in the exaggerated *ego* of Commodus: *καὶ τίλος καὶ οἱ μῆνες ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πάντες ἐπεκλήθησαν, ὥστε καταριθμῆσθαι αὐτοὺς οὕτως, Ἀμαζόνιος Ἀνίκτος Εὐτυχὴς Εὐσεβὴς Λούκιος Αἴλιος Αἰρήλιος Κόμμοδος Αὐγουστος Ἡράκλειος Ῥωμαῖος Ὑπεράτωρ.*

Here the order indicates that the month Commodus was August; and this is definitely stated by the fourth-century *Scriptores Historiae*

Augustae, VII. (Commodus), xi. 8: *Menses quoque in honorem eius pro Augusto Commodum, pro Septembri Herculem, pro Octobri Inuictum, pro Nouembri Exsuperatorium, pro Decembri Amazonium ex signo ipsius adulatores uocabant*, where in other respects a different version of the affair is followed.

The month Commodus seems especially to have impressed the fancy of the Romans, for it is mentioned repeatedly by the compilers and grammarians of the fourth and later centuries: Aurelius Victor, *Caess.* XVII. 2, *Septembrem mensem Commodum appellauerat*; Eutropius VIII. 15, *Septembrem mensem ad nomen suum transferre conatus est, ut Commodus diceretur* (where the version of Paianios gives the month as November and says that the attempt failed); Jerome, *Chron.* a. Abr. 2200, *Commodus Septembrem mensem nomine suo appellauit*; Prosper, in *Chron. Min.* ed. Mommsen, I, p. 432, section 711, *Commodus Septembrem mensem nomine suo appellauit*; *Corpus Gloss. Lat.* ed. Loewe-Goetz, IV. p. 258, l. 13, *Mensis Commodus September mensis*; *id.*, V., p. 572, l. 53, *Mensis Commodus September*. Curiously enough, all these later sources (except Paianios) state that the month in question was not August but September; but as some of them evidently, and others probably, copied one from another, or drew from a common source, their agreement does not lend cumulative value to their evidence.

This short-lived nomenclature is used once in the *Scr. Hist. Aug.*, VII. (Commodus), xii. 6: *III. nonas Commodias (sic)*; but until now the only epigraphic vestige of the mad emperor's innovation has been the date on the side of the

marble base at Lanuvium, *C.I.L.* XIV., 2113 (Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.* 5193), as given by Pighius: . . . *idus Commodas*.

The present inscription is also of importance, because its date serves as a *terminus ante quem* for the painted stucco on which it is incised.

Below it is another *graffito*: *VIII. id. Iun.*

In the inscription reproduced as Fig. 12 on columns 371 f. of *Monumenti Antichi* above cited, the proper name should be transcribed *Hermadion*.

The revised reading of the two *graffiti* reproduced as Figs. 14 and 15 on cols. 373 f. necessitates a partial revision of previous ideas as to the occupants of these quarters and the pleasures which are here commemorated; for not all the names are masculine, as had been thought. Of the trio in the first inscription, the second person was undoubtedly *Prima*; the final A is above suspicion. As for the third name, I am not convinced that it was *Epaphroditus*. With all due reserve, one is tempted to suggest that after the ET which followed *PRIMA*, the scribe carelessly repeated ET and blundered on for two letters more; he then cancelled the four offending letters by means of transverse strokes, and followed them by *MODSTVS*: the reading then would be *Agathopus et Prima et* (four deleted letters) *Mod(ē)stus tres conuenientes*.

A woman's name, too, is found in the second of these two compromising *graffiti*: *Musice* is not common, but there are sufficient other instances (in -a or -e) given in De-Vit's *Onomasticon s.v.* The name of her male companion is *Nicephorus*: the two letters NI at the beginning are clear at the present time. The transcription then should read *Nicephorus et Musice duo conuenientes*.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

'Ο μέγας Πάν τέθνηκε.

THE story told by Plutarch in ch. 17 of his treatise *de defectu oraculorum* has from later misconstructions obtained considerable celebrity. S. Reinach's theory¹ that the cry heard off Paxos was 'Θαμούς Θαμούς Θαμούς πάνμεγας τέθνηκε' is hardly possible; the Greek name of Thammuz was 'Αδωνίς. A. B. Cook's ingenious hypothesis² that Zan was really meant also misses the mark; Zan is not likely to have been thought of as a δαίμων, and the story of his death is familiar and quite different.³ G. A. Gerhard's connexion of it with yearly-dying vegetation spirits and the origin of tragedy⁴ will hardly win much support.

Gerhard begs the question in saying that the good faith of Plutarch's authority Epitherses is not to be doubted.⁵ The circumstantial char-

acter of the story proves nothing. In the next chapter Demetrius says that he saw things even more wonderful in Britain; earlier in the work we read astonishing statements which purport to be the scientific observations of the philosopher Ammonius.⁶ In Lucian's *Philopseudes* we find a number of men who would, like Epitherses, be called οὐκ ἀφρονες οὐδ' ἀλαζόνες, telling impossible stories in quite as circumstantial a manner. I need not refer to the detailed inventiveness shown by Philostratus in his *Life of Apollonius*, or to the fantastic embroidery of signs and wonders added to the proceedings between Alexandrian Greeks and Jews in the so-called Alexandrine 'Martyr-akten'.⁷

The motif of the story itself, as Mannhardt saw fifty years ago,⁸ is one of very common occurrence in various lands; beside the German story of the cry announcing Salome's death, and followed by loud wailing of many voices,⁹ may be set the Arabian story of the cry 'The great king of the Jinn is dead,'¹⁰ and there are other parallels. Plutarch, or more probably some source of Plutarch's, used this old motif¹¹ as the kernel of his tale. He localised the incident on the route from Greece to Italy, but in an obscure spot, and made the person who was addressed an Egyptian sailor with an Egyptian name.¹² The sailor answered, it will be observed, on the third cry: I need not enlarge on the frequency with which the number three occurs in religious and magical connexions.¹³ Tiberius was a particularly appropriate Caesar to bring into the story, in view of his mythological interests.¹⁴ A similar story in which he occurs is that of the man who invented malleable glass and was put to death lest his discovery should destroy the value of the precious metals.¹⁵ Tiberius was clearly a figure around whom such tales would gather. In any case, the time of the incident was not defined with precision within the limits of his reign: ποτὲ πλείων εἰς Ἰταλίαν, says Epitherses. As for ὁ μέγας Πάν, the force of the epithet is probably to denote the great Pan as opposed to the herd of Πάνες καὶ Σάτυροι; here again Mannhardt was, I think, right. The god meant is certainly not the cosmic deity which Orphic and Neoplatonic speculation produced by ety-

⁶ Ch. iv.

⁷ As *P. Oxy.* 1242, 41—.

⁸ *Wald- und Feldkulte*, ii., pp. 134, 148.

⁹ *Ib.*, p. 147.

¹⁰ J. G. Frazer, *The Dying God*, p. 8; *g.* Gerhard, *op. cit.*, p. 35, *Wien. Stud.*, xxxviii., p. 371.

¹¹ We need not imagine he used any literary development of it, as Gruppe seems to think (*Bursians Jahresbericht*, lxxxv., p. 274).

¹² For Θαμούς we can quote Plato, *Phaedrus*, 274, D.E., Polyæn. *Strateg.* iii. 11. 5; Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (1922), p. 127, gives instances of Θαμούς, Θαμῶνς, and the like.

¹³ Cf. W. H. Roscher, *Fleck. Jahrb.* xxxviii. (1892), p. 476.

¹⁴ Reinach, *Cultes*, iii., p. 11. Mannhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 134, quoting Plin. *n.h.* ix. 9.

¹⁵ Dio lvii. 21; Petron. *sat.* 51; Plin. *n.h.* 36, 66, 195 (sceptical).

¹ *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xxxi. (1907), p. 5—= *Cultes, Mythes, et Religions*, III., p. 1—.

² *Zeus*, ii., p. 347—I must here express my warmest thanks to Mr. Cook for giving me proof-sheets.

³ *Anthol. pal.* vii. 746, cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, ii., p. 345.

⁴ 'Der Tod des grossen Pan' in *Sitzb. ber. Heidelb.*, 1915, v., p. 50.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 7.

mological means,¹ and he can hardly be the Egyptian Chem identified with Pan,² although the fact that this so-called Pan was styled μέγιστος³ may have given a special appropriateness to the choice of an Egyptian to receive the message.

I would suggest in closing that the author of the story may have constructed it with an eye on the story of Philipides: 'ἀπαγγεῖλον ὅτι Πάν ὁ μέγας τέθηκε' suggests 'κελεύσαι ἀπαγγεῖλαι διότι ἑωντοῦ οὐδεμίαν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖνται'.⁴

A. D. NOCK.

CLEON AND THE ASSEMBLY.

EVERYONE knows Plutarch's story, told briefly in *praec. ger. reip.* 3, and more fully in *Nicias* 7. λέγεται γάρ, ἐκκλησίας ποτὲ οὐσης, τὸν μὲν δῆμον καθήμενον ἄνω περιμένειν πολὺν χρόνον, ὅπῃ δ' εἰσελθεῖν ἐκείνον ἐσπεφανωμένον, καὶ παρακαλεῖν ὑπερβῆσθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰς αἶριον. Ἀσχολοῦμαι γάρ, ἔφη, σήμερον, ἐστὶν μὲλλον ξένους καὶ τεθωκὸς τοῖς θεοῖς. τοὺς δ' Ἀθηναίους γέλασαντας ἀναστῆναι καὶ διαλῦσαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. It is a tall story, but it seems to have passed muster; it finds a place in Kahrstedt's recent article 'Kleon' in *Paulys-Wissowa*. But visualise the scene! The patient Assembly, the unconscionable wait, the wreathed Cleon; his words are a song, and Plutarch has not spoil the metre.

ἐστὶν μὲλλον ξένους
καὶ τεθωκὸς τοῖς θεοῖς
ἀσכולοῦμαι σήμερον.

We know this person. He is drunk, and two girls support him. He is Dicaeopolis, Trygaeus, Pisthetaerus—the triumphant hero in the closing scenes of an Aristophanic comedy. Did the poet (Aristophanes or another) leave him to enjoy an ironically exaggerated triumph? Or did a final peripety kick him into the wings? We can only guess; but we have won another glimpse into the methods of ancient biography.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

HERODOTOS AND WESTERMARCK.

HERODOTOS tells us (IV. 189) that the *ololyge* was characteristic of Libyan women; δοκέει δ' ἐμοί γε καὶ ἡ ὀλολυγὴ ἐν ἱροῖσι ἐνθαῦτα πρῶτον γενέσθαι· κάρτα γὰρ ταύτη χρέωνται αἱ Λίβυσσαι, καὶ χρέωνται καλῶς. As his nomad Libyans are presumably the ancestors of the modern Berbers, it is noteworthy that the latter, and also their Arab neighbours, are in the habit of making a peculiar sound called in Arabic *zgārīt* and in Berber *tagūrit*, mentioned by Westermarck many times in his valuable work,

Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco, as occurring at various stages in the ceremonies of betrothal and at the wedding itself. He quotes (p. 22 n. 2) the following description from Dr. Jansen:

'(The sound is) durch äusserst schnelle, horizontale oder seitliche Bewegung der Zungenspitze zwischen den Lippenwinckeln hervorgebracht . . . wobei ein schriller Trillerlaut entsteht, der fast wie ein hundertmal äusserst schnell wiederholtes "lü" klingt . . . (etwa in der Tonhöhe des zweigestrichenen f . . .), ungefähr $\frac{1}{2}$ bis $\frac{3}{4}$ Minute (solange der Atem vorhält) dauert und plötzlich mit einem sehr kurzen, sich wie ". . . it" anhörenden Abschnapp-Laute zum dreigestrichenen c . . . hinauf-schnellend schliesst.'

The attempts to restrict the *ololyge* to this or that particular rite, or to make it expressive of joy (or sorrow) only are, it is to be hoped, at an end, after Eitrem's careful review of all the evidence, *Beiträge zur gr. Religionsgeschichte*, III., p. 44 ff. It is a ritual cry denoting excitement and high tension, and no doubt felt to be very efficacious in scaring away evil influences and arousing good ones. As the form of the words ὀλολυγὴ and ἀελίω show, it was made by holding the mouth in the position for a close vowel, back or front (o or e), and moving the tongue rapidly to and from the position of l; concluding with an abrupt rise of pitch, shown by the acute accent, and an occlusive which sounded something like g. The only difference between this and the modern account is that the later evidence gives a still closer vowel, *ü*, and makes the occlusive dental (t) instead of palatal (g). The latter was not a constant feature to the Greek ear; the cognate ἀελεῦ has no occlusive at all.⁵

H. J. ROSE.

A NOTEWORTHY SURVIVAL.

IN describing the effects of the heavenly bodies upon terrestrial life Cicero (*de Div.* 2, 33) remarks: *et muscutorum iecuscula bruma dicuntur augeri, et puleium aridum florescere brumali ipso die*, etc. The habit here ascribed to pennyroyal (*Mentha pulegium* L.) is also attested by other ancient writers, e.g. [Arist.] *Probl.* 20, 21, p. 925a, 19 ff.: διὰ τὴν γλῆχων . . . ὑπὸ τὰς τροπὰς ἀνθεῖ; Plin. *N.H.* 2, 108: *floret ipso brumali die suspensa in tectis arentis herba pulei* (cf. 18, 227; 19, 160): Lyd. *de Ost.* p. 13 Wachsm.: ὁ δὲ λεγόμενος γλῆχων ὑπ' αὐτὴν τὴν <τοῦ ἡλίου> θάλλει τροπῇ.

The purpose of the present note is to call attention to a remarkable survival of this belief Folkard, *Plant Lore, Legends, and Lyrics* (1884),

⁵ ἀλαλαί with its broader vowel is a cry of quite different character, made with the mouth wider open; more of a man's cheer and less of a woman's shriek. The man with the sistrum on the H. Triada processional vase (latest discussion, M. Hammarström in *Acta Acad. Aboensis Humaniora* III., 1922, No. 2) may be raising this cry, certainly not an ὀλολυγὴ, for his mouth is wide open.

¹ On whom cf. W. H. Roscher, *Festschrift Overbeck*, p. 56.

² As W. H. Roscher, *Fleck. Jahrb.*, xxxviii. (1892), p. 465.

³ Cf. B. Müller, *Diss. phil. Hal.* XXI., iii., p. 349, for the evidence.

⁴ Hdt. vi. 105; cf. Pausan. i. 28. 4, 'οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ἀγγελίᾳ τετίμηται.'

492 (with no apparent acquaintance with any of the ancient passages), states: 'In Sicily children put pennyroyal in their cots on Christmas Day, under the belief that at the exact hour and minute when the infant Jesus was born this plant puts forth its blossom. The same wonder is repeated on Midsummer Night.'

It would appear, then, that the Christmas custom has been, in popular usage, substituted for one belonging to the winter solstice (25 December, according to the Julian calendar; cf. Plin. *N.H.* 18, 221; Häbler in Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v.* *Bruma* (1897); Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 5, 3 ed. (1914), 393-305, for the transference of the birth of Christ to the winter solstice, the natal day of *Sol Invictus*), and the reference of Folkard to the same belief in connexion with Midsummer Night makes this yet more certain.¹

All these ideas perhaps owe their origin to a feeling that the return (rebirth) of the sun at the winter solstice is the signal for a revival of vegetation, and that the first sympathetic responses to the sun's waxing powers may come from plants characterised by exceptionally keen, volatile (and sensitive?) qualities. Be this as it may, the persistence of the belief in the case of pennyroyal is at least worthy of remark.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE.

AESCHYLUS, *SEPTEM C. THEBAS*, 101-102.

πέπλων καὶ στεφάνων πύτ' εἰ μὴ νῦν ἀμ-
φὶ λῑτάν' ἔξομεν;

ἀμφὶ λῑτάν' Seidler: ἀμφὶ λῑταν M: ἀμφὶ λῑτάν, m.

THIS is taken to mean (and with the active ἔξομεν it could mean nothing else) that the chorus propose to place around the images of the gods mentioned in ll. 95, 97, 'objects used in prayer, consisting of robes and garlands.' The adjective λῑτάνος, substituted for λῑτάν for metrical reasons, is quoted only from Aeschylus, *Supplices* 809 (μέλη λῑτανά); the meaning given to it here is surely a counsel of despair. The form εὐκραῖος could no doubt be used in this way (cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 631), but that was because εὐχή had acquired a concrete sense; a votive altar was sometimes dedicated κατ' εὐχὴν, sometimes it was itself an εὐχή. I can find no trace of such a use of λῑτή. In any case, the absence of the dative of βρέτη or βωμοί is a fatal objection to Seidler's view.

The accent of ἀμφὶ λῑταν in M preserves a trace of the original reading ἀμ φ ἰ δ ὐ τ' ἄ ν ἔ ξ ο μ ε ν. For displaying objects in prayer,

¹ Certain Moroccan customs connecting pennyroyal with the summer solstice are noted by Westermarck in *Folk-Lore*, 16 (1905), 34-35. Further, compare the belief described by Tille (*Yule and Christmas*, 1899, 170-176), that on the night before Christmas the trees of the forest bud and blossom forth; and for the sympathetic effects of the solstices in general see Stempinger *Sympathieglauhe u. Sympathiekuren in Altertum u. Neuzeit* (1919), 11.

ἀνέχειν (see L. and S.) was the regular term; and ἀμφιδύτος, not quoted in the *Lexica*, follows as naturally from ἀμφιδύω as ἐνδύτος from ἐνδύω and suits the στεφάνη at least as well as ἐνδύτος in Eur. *Troad.* 258.

Two good authorities, Professors Rose and Nilsson, tell me that they know no reference to any special costume worn by suppliants, or to any emblem except the κλάδοι (for which see Jebb on *Oed. Tyr.* 3). The reference therefore cannot be to robes and garlands worn by the suppliants, but to robes and garlands which they are carrying (or propose to fetch) to offer to the gods, like the πέπλος offered by Hecabe to Athena in the *Iliad*. Accordingly, ἀμφιδύτω refers to the purpose of the gift, the decking of the images of the gods. We thus arrive at a meaning similar to that suggested by Seidler, but by a legitimate route. 'When, if not now, shall we lift up robes and garlands to deck the gods withal?' W. M. CALDER.

THE PROBABLE ERROR OF A WATER-CLOCK.

I CONTRIBUTED an article under this title, based on a paper by Miss Longbottom and myself in *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, LXXV. (1915), 377-94, to the *Classical Review* for December, 1915 (XXIX., 236-8). In that article the probable error of a water-clock was discussed in the light of seven ancient observations of the moon. Last year Herr Schoch of Heidelberg, now of Berlin, kindly drew my attention to an arithmetical error in our work, and I have contributed a paper containing the necessary corrections to *Monthly Notices*, LXXXIII. (1923), 370-3.

I now find that the observations accord best on the supposition that the time of each observation was compared with sunset. On this assumption the 'probable' error of the clock works out at 7.6 minutes per hour, but it will be observed that the actual rate of error varies considerably from the probable rate. In the following table the recorded time of each observation is compared with the actual time, the change in the moon's rate of motion being for the present purpose determined from these observations only.

Recorded Interval from Sunset.		Actual Interval from Sunset.		Error of Clock.	Rate of Error per Clock-Hour.
h.	m.	h.	m.	m.	m.
2	14	2	49	+35	+15.8
2	37	1	38	-59	-22.5
3	11	2	59	-12	-3.8
10	26	12	3	+1h. 36	+9.2
10	26	10	0	-26	-2.5
13	8	13	42	+34	+2.6
13	12	12	33	-39	-3.0

Corrections to the motion of the moon obtained independently of these observations suggest that the actual intervals from sunset should be diminished by eleven or twelve minutes in each case and the errors corrected accordingly.

In view of the extensive use of water-clocks in antiquity, it is hoped that this study will give some idea of the errors to which such clocks were liable.

J. K. FOTHERINGHAM.

NOTE ON LIVY, 42, 35, 2.

'Ceteri centuriones praemissa appellatione ad dilectum oboedienter responderunt.' A very old corruption appears in the MS. *praemissa*, which is meaningless in the context. Kreyssig's correction *remissa* (Vahlen, *Ephem. Austr.* 1861, p. 255, cited by Zingerle *ad loc.*) has found general acceptance. This seems to

be an interesting case of the error discussed by Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, p. 333, sect. 419: 'The ancient Nota for 'ter' (word or syllable) was *t*, with a stroke through the shaft of the letter (like *p* with stroke through the shaft for 'per'). It must have been easy to mistake this for an obliterated *t*, a *t* which had been written by error and was struck out by the scribe or by a corrector. It is not surprising to find that the ancient Nota has been generally replaced in medieval MSS. by a less dangerous symbol, *t* with suprascript stroke.' Read *praetermissa appellatione*.

H. W. LITCHFIELD.

Cambridge, Mass.

REVIEWS

SOME TRANSLATIONS.¹

If any further proof were necessary to show the futility of those philosophers who deduce human action from some easily intelligible motive, such as desire for personal advantage, such proof would be supplied by the existence and multiplication of translations of Greek and Latin poetry. The general public seldom reads them; they are never among the best sellers. The learned usually disparage them for their frivolity. Why, then, do such translations continue to be published? Obviously, because they are a good *ἀπλῶς*, in themselves, apart from their accidents. A translation, like a virtuous action, is its own reward. The present season shows no diminution of the usual output. Horace continues to attract. The Greek Anthology challenges skill and enterprise, like Mount Everest. Greek tragedy is to be seen on the stage, and obviously the public mind must acquire some idea of what it is about; and the *doyen* of modern metrical translators, Dr. Way, now adds Pindar to the catalogue of his triumphs.

Undoubtedly the Epinician odes

are the hardest nut which even Dr. Way has ever set himself to crack. Apart from the mere difficulty of unravelling the meaning of the Greek, how are the bold dithyrambs of Pindar to be confined within the limits of such metrical systems as an English ear (except that of the minority which professes to be satisfied with *vers libre*) inevitably demands? Dr. Way does so confine Pindar; and no doubt he is right. There is no equally effective method: 'in our simpler lyrical forms,' Mr. Trevelyan says, in the introduction to his *Oresteia*, 'the structure is generally delineated and emphasised by rhyme, rather than by complicated variations and changes of internal rhythm.' In the circumstances allowance must be made for necessary limitations. The emotions of a reader of Pindar—it is laid down by Mr. John Addington Symonds—should be those of him who while reading can fancy himself 'playing such a motette on Mozart's *Splendente te Deus* in the chapel of Mont St. Michel, which is built like a lighthouse on a rock, at the bottom of which the sea is churning in a tempest.' Can Pindar, reduced to English metrical form and order, produce this mental elevation? Can he still 'combine the strong flight of the eagle, the irresistible force of the torrent, the richness of Greek wine, the majestic pageantry of Nature in one of her sublimer moods?' Be that as it may, Dr. Way is to be congratulated on a

¹ The Odes of Pindar in English Verse, by A. S. Way; *The Reed of Pan*, by A. C. Benson; *Amaranth and Asphodel*, by A. J. Butler; *A Fardel of Epigrams*, by F. P. Barnard; *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles*, translated by J. T. Sheppard; *The Oresteia of Aeschylus*, translated by R. C. Trevelyan; *The Odes of Horace*, Englished by W. H. Mills; Stevenson, R. L.: *A Child's Garden of Verses*, done into Latin by T. R. Glover.

skilful and altogether notable achievement.

The game of translating the Greek Anthology is always popular, partly because it involves not so much continuity of effort as a series of separate enterprises; you can take an epigram out for a walk and do it in your head, and there it is, *teres atque rotundus*, a thing finished. But the sport is one of great difficulty; all the more, of course, because translators naturally choose the best and the best-known epigrams, where the difference of effect attainable by the Greek and the English lyric respectively is most clearly presented. The Greek language can attain the highest lyrical effect by a simple directness with which English is seldom quite satisfied. If you add something for an English ear, you may miss the conciseness which Greek can combine with beauty; if you do not add something, you miss the beauty which Greek can combine with conciseness. Here are two volumes, which by their diverse excellences themselves illustrate the translator's difficulty. It would be impossible to find two scholars better equipped for their task, whether by intimate knowledge of Greek or by impeccability of taste and judgment, than the authors of *The Reed of Pan* and *Amaranth and Asphodel*. Modern readers are fortunate in having presented to them simultaneously two volumes so charming in every respect, and so worthy to represent the scholarship and culture of Oxford and Cambridge. To say that, where they can be directly compared, Dr. Butler is on the whole the closer to the Greek, and Mr. Benson is the more fluent—this is to draw no odious comparison; it merely emphasises the distinctive merit of each. Both are brilliantly successful; the thing, probably, could not be done better. And more clearly than ever after this crucial experiment the plain fact emerges, that Greek is one thing and English is another; also, that the equivalent of the Greek elegiac has still to be found. Mr. Barnard's pleasant collection of versions, which he calls a 'Fardel of Epigrams,' is less ambitious while more catholic. His originals are for the most part the work of 'the

undeservedly neglected Neo-Latin and French epigrammatists of the late fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries.' Most of them are more notable for point than for high poetical beauty; and the point can be well reproduced in English. Mr. Barnard deserves thanks for rescuing much that was in danger of being forgotten.

Perhaps the most complete and satisfying success can be obtained by versions of Greek tragedy, at least of the dialogue. Both Mr. Sheppard and Mr. R. C. Trevelyan maintain the best traditions of Cambridge scholarship. Both are effective in the dialogue. Mr. Trevelyan, writing obviously with an eye to dramatic representation (indeed, his *Oresteia* is the completion of what began as the acting version of the trilogy in 1921), is the more ingenious in the lyrical part, in so far as his choruses, while very literal, are metrically equivalent to the Greek; while the choric passages of Mr. Sheppard's *Oedipus Tyrannus* are simply in *vers libre*, more or less rhythmical, but unhymed and not aiming at metrical correspondence with the Greek.

No batch of translations can ever be complete without its Horace; and here are the Odes again, done into English verse by Mr. William Hathorn Mills. Well, and why not? If a gentleman can rhyme, and scan, and translate Latin without making mistakes, there is no valid reason against his rendering the *Odes* of Horace into verse if he pleases. There are a thousand less creditable occupations.

Concerning translations from the classical languages into English, let so much have been said. The Public Orator of the University of Cambridge is an exponent of the reverse process; and perhaps he is really the most enterprising of all, for he translates Stevenson's *Child's Garden of Verses* into a number of Latin metres. This is a real *tour de force*. Most of the *Child's Garden* is playful; and even if we had the appropriate Latin vocabulary, which unfortunately we have not, very few Latin metres have playful associations; least of all, the much-enduring elegiac. Hendecasyllables are better adapted

to th
them
lic O

The C
on
Ser
M.
An
Liv
poc
poc
Sto

THIS
part
Worl
and t
best -
Halli
he ca
critic
terest
histor
versit
tional
persp
discu
period
politi
treate
grant
are s
stand
look o
more.
histor
at the
pende
puts i
thing
ably h

The
series
states
sions
enviro
origin
what
histor
specia
terise
and I
their
princi

to this vein; and Mr. Glover employs them pretty often. Anyhow, the Public Orator shows great ingenuity and

finished scholarship, and a most enviable command of Latin metres.

A. D. GODLEY.

HALLIDAY'S 'CITY STATE.'

The Growth of the City State: Lectures on Greek and Roman History. First Series. By W. R. HALLIDAY, M.A., B.Litt., Rathbone Professor of Ancient History in the University of Liverpool. 8vo. Pp. 264. Liverpool: The University Press of Liverpool, Ltd.; London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1923. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS useful and suggestive volume is part of a series entitled *The Ancient World*, of which Professor Peet's *Egypt and the Old Testament* is probably the best-known instalment. Professor Halliday's frank preface, explaining how he came to write it, almost disarms criticism, and is at the same time an interesting glimpse of the difficulties of historical teaching in the newer Universities. For obvious reasons, traditional presentations have to be recast, perspective has to be deeper, incidental discussion rarer; aspects of the same period have to be treated separately, as political and economic questions are treated here; less may be taken for granted, yet the limits of discussion are stricter. What remains must be standard material, yet the personal outlook of the teacher nowhere counts for more. An introduction to ancient history, under these conditions, must be at the same time a challenge to independent work: as Professor Halliday puts it, 'a reader who fails to find something with which to disagree will probably have wasted his time.'

The contents, then, of this 'first series' of chapters on the ancient city states fall into three sections: discussions of the main aspects of the physical environment in which these states originated and matured; outlines of what might be called the normal life-history of such a state, and of the special deviations from it which characterise the political history of Athens and Rome, from their beginnings to their maturity; and sketches of the principal economic problem—namely,

the land question—with which these two states in particular were confronted so persistently, and of the actual living conditions of their average inhabitants. In the last department, it should be noted, we miss the 'new Gallus'—shall we call him Caesar or Clodius?—who might have been the counterpart of Professor Halliday's *Pheidippides*. But perhaps there are only eight lecture periods at Liverpool, as in more ancient Universities.

Into modest compass (with adequate notes after each chapter, and an excellent index) are here packed more sound doctrine, and 'humanity' in the best sense, than in any recent book of the kind. One might 'disagree,' as we are invited to do, with details of presentation; phrases about the 'Balkan Range' in Aegean geography; about Crete shutting in the 'bottom' of the Aegean. Did Chalcis and Eretria 'bleed each other to death in the Lelantine War'? Does the commercial development of 'quay-side' Syra (Professor Halliday's own instance) follow or precede the bombardment of Alexandria, with which he connects it? Were there no Etruscans in Italy before the eighth century? Was *Dike* originally either 'rightness' or 'equity'; or rather just a *formula* in the Roman legal sense, from which the commonsense of all might discern where the 'right' lay? In the matter of Greek and Roman personal names (p. 142), what Herodotus was concerned to learn about Isagoras was not his *genos*, but whether that *genos* was 'earthborn' or 'Neleid from Pylos' or of northerly origin like the Gephyraeans. Were there no hereditary *Patres*, as well as *Conscripti*, in the regal Senate? Was the censorial *lustrum* a numbering 'followed by a solemn purification' (p. 147) and not itself the 'purification,' in the sense that unseemly citizens were degraded or cast out?

But these are small and perhaps con-

troversial griefs. So scholarly and readable a book, it may be hoped, will reach the reprint which it deserves, and

justify the preparation of the 'second series' on lines so serviceable and so well planned.

J. L. MYRES.

HENDERSON'S HADRIAN.

The Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian, A.D. 76-138. By BERNARD W. HENDERSON, M.A., D.Litt. Pp. xi+304, 8 plates. London: Methuen, 1923. 15s.

THE important place in the history of the Roman Empire occupied by the Principate of Hadrian makes the appearance of the first detailed account of it by an English scholar an event of considerable interest. But the importance of the period is equalled by the difficulties which must be faced in treating of it. The perfect historian of Hadrian must be archaeologist, numismatist, epigraphist, textual critic, literary scholar, and historical lawyer; and the nature of the sources he will employ are such that finality is beyond the reach even of one so equipped. The personality of the Emperor must always remain a problem to which no more than a subjective solution is possible, and our knowledge of the details of his administration, though it may be expected gradually to increase, can never approach completeness.

For the treatment of this second part of his task Dr. Henderson is imperfectly equipped. He suggests in the Preface the difficulties under which he laboured—the long interruption caused by the War, the ill-health which followed it, and the distractions of an Oxford tutor's life. But if these troubles explain the defects, it must still be admitted that in some parts of the book they are serious. We are provided with copious footnotes, bibliographies, appendices, which suggest that the work is not a popular sketch but a serious contribution to history, and it must be said outright that the more recent authorities have not been sufficiently consulted, nor the bibliographies brought up to date. In two cases, Hadrian's arrival in Rome in 118 and the end of his first great tour, the chronology is vitiated by the neglect to consider inscriptions published in 1902

and 1905. In his discussion of the African inscriptions which give us information concerning Hadrian's agrarian policy, Bruns' *Fontes* is quoted in the sixth instead of the seventh edition, two articles dealing with the Ain Djemala inscription are referred to that of Ain Wassel, no reference at all is given for the text of the former, nor to Rostowzew's most important discussion of the whole matter (*Studien zur Gesch. des röm. Kolonates*, pp. 313-409). Dr. Henderson denies the possibility of discovering the details of Hadrian's work in Upper Germany, relying on Essays of Pelham (1905) and Kornemann (1907), and omitting to notice the important work since carried out by the *Limes* Commission and summarised in its sixth and tenth *Berichte*. The proof-reading, too, leaves something to be desired. On p. 24 a conjecture is based on the statement that Plotina died in 128; on p. 44 the date is given (correctly) as 122. We twice find the title of Hadrian's law given as 'de rudibus agris' (instead of 'rudibus'), and on p. 112 Lobeck is credited with the writing of a work entitled *Aglaophonos*.

It is pleasanter to turn to the undoubted merits of the book. Assisted by Mr. Collingwood, Dr. Henderson gives an excellent, if rather sanguine, account of the present state of our knowledge concerning 'Hadrian's Wall.' His discussion of Hadrian's Legal Reforms is clear and comprehensive, and will prove most useful to students not expert in Roman Law. In contrast with his handling of archaeological material, his treatment of the literary evidence is almost always judicious and sensible, and we are obliged to him for providing an almost complete translation of the *Sententiae* of Dositheus, a source not easily accessible, and though of slight historical value, curiously interesting and, as he remarks, an agreeable addition (and contrast) to our other information. He has succeeded in giving

a picture of the personality of Hadrian which, although it may provoke dissent in some details, is self-consistent, and in the main plausible.

When, however, he says 'religion was not one of Hadrian's hobbies' we must be allowed to differ from him. In spite of Spartianus' statement 'sacra peregrina contempsit,' it is hard to believe that the numberless towns in the East which hailed the Emperor as the Olympian, or the New Dionysus, or the New Heracles, thought him wholly indifferent; or that the Emperor who took special pains to be completely initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries, who consolidated into one the guilds of Dionysiac artists, who founded a cult and an oracle for his minion, took no interest at least in ritual. And the Tribe and Deme names of his new foundation of Antinoë (to which, unfortunately, Dr. Henderson makes no reference) show his desire that the whole official worship of the new πόλις should centre round the Imperial House. But Dr. Henderson is no doubt right when he points out that Hadrian was certainly not religious in

the sense that Marcus was a philosopher—in a word, religion was a hobby, not the ruling interest of his life.

Dr. Henderson has a high opinion of the poetic merit of the *Animula vagula blandula*, of which he gives two versions of his own as well as several other translations and adaptations. His first may be set down side by side with what is perhaps still the most successful version—that of the late Principal of Aberdeen University, Sir W. D. Geddes:

Little tender wand'ring soul,
Body's guest and comrade thou,
To what bourne, all bare and pale,
Will thou be a'faring now?
All the merry jest and play
Thou so lovest put away.

B. H.

Wee wan'ering, winsome elf, my saul,
Thou's made this clay lang hoose and hall,
But whar, O whar, art now to dwell,
Thy bield now bare?

Gaun' flichterin', feckless, shiverin', caul'
Nae cantrips mair.

W. D. G.

The translation of the last line is the real test.

D. ATKINSON.

BOAK'S HISTORY OF ROME.

A History of Rome to 565 A.D. By ARTHUR E. R. BOAK, Ph.D. Pp. 444. Macmillan, 1922.

MR. BOAK'S book is 'primarily intended to meet the needs of introductory college courses in Roman History; but it is hoped that it may also prove of service as a handbook for students of Roman life and literature in general.' The difficulties of thus treating the subject within the compass of a little more than four hundred pages are obvious. The writer must avoid two dangers, that of dealing in detail with some favoured periods to the exclusion of others, as well as that of compiling a monotonous series of facts and dates from which the reader will fail to trace the causal relation of events or gain any idea of the social and material conditions which form their background. Mr. Boak has in the main avoided both with considerable success. His account of the early history of Rome and the conquest

of Italy gives a clear account both of the development of Roman government and society and of the external organisation by which the conquest was rendered possible and its effects permanent. In this section the sketch of the relations between Rome and the various political units subjected to her may be specially commended: it might well have been extended by the omission of the paragraphs, too brief to be of much value, which deal with the early pre-history of Italy. In the later history of the Republic Mr. Boak was perhaps a little embarrassed by the greater extent and variety of the material to be compressed into 140 pages. Mere narrative of events occupies an undue proportion of the space, and the treatment of incidents seems conditioned rather by the extent of our information about them than by their intrinsic importance. Thus the conspiracy of Catiline receives a whole page, while

Cicero's attempted 'Concordia Ordinum' is not mentioned at all.

But Mr. Boak's previous writings make us turn with especial interest to the chapters on the Early and Later Empire. Here clearly the problem of arrangement becomes still more acute. The plan adopted is to divide the six centuries treated into three periods—(a) to Diocletian, (b) thence to Theodosius, and (c) from 395 to the death of Justinian. For each period he devotes a chapter each to the political history, to the public administration, and to religion and society. In each case the first section could with advantage have been spared. As it is, as much space is here devoted to Caligula as to Claudius, and it may be doubted whether even a short paragraph on a Macrinus or an Elagabalus is worth the space it occupies. A chronological table of the reigns, serving as a framework for the events and developments of real importance, would have set free valuable space for a more adequate description of these.

But even thus limited, Mr. Boak has made good use of modern researches to make a most useful summary. The development of the Civil Service, the growth of a centralised bureaucracy, the gradual weakening under its malign influence of municipal activities, the progressive crushing of all forms of social organisation into a system for the collection of an increasingly oppressive taxation, are admirably sketched. Equally good and clear is his account

of the Colonate. It is plainly in this field that Mr. Boak's chief interests lie, and consequently it is here that the most recent special studies are best utilised. His account of the development of the provinces and their defences, though adequate, is not so firmly based. Here the latest results are not quite always employed. On p. 275, for example, the theory of a Hadrianic turf wall in North Britain, rebuilt in stone by Severus, is stated as a fact, though it was disproved in 1911; and the attribution to Domitian of the 'limes' across the Odenwald is at least open to question. But these are points of detail; in general the work may safely be recommended to the increasing body of students whose chief interest in Roman history begins (instead of ending) with Augustus. For these its value is much increased by a carefully compiled and classified bibliography.

But it is time that a protest was made against the lack of completeness with which publishers do their work. There was perhaps an excuse for leaving uncut the edges of unbound books in the days before the price of binding became prohibitive, but it is a scandal that a well bound and not inexpensive volume should be left to the purchaser to be cut not only at the top but at the bottom also, leaving rough edges to collect a coating of dust which nothing can remove. Historical students at least are less interested in 'tall copies' than in cleanliness and convenience.

D. ATKINSON.

PLATNAUER'S CLAUDIAN.

Claudian. With an English translation by MAURICE PLATNAUER. Two vols. Pp. xxvi+393; v+413. London: William Heinemann (Loeb Classical Library), 1922. £1.

ON more than one ground Mr. Platnauer's *Claudian* claims our attention. For the first time in this country a text has been produced, which rests on real foundations, of the works of a writer of whom Gibbon could say that 'Claudian is read with pleasure in every country which has retained, or acquired, the knowledge of the Latin tongue.' These

are the foundations laid by Th. Birt in his edition of 1892 in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (reviewed at length in C.R. IX. 162-168), which was also the basis of the Teubner text of J. Koch. The previous text was that which, left unfinished by Richard Heber, the famous bibliophile, was brought out in 1836 after his death by H. D.—that is, Henry Drury, the compiler of the Cambridge Classical Anthology *Arun- dines Cami*. For the last thirty years Claudian has been all but entirely neglected. And Mr. Platnauer's text

differs inconsiderably from Birt's. Where it does, the change is generally an improvement. Again, in Mr. Platnauer's translation Claudian is for the first time Englished in prose. His predecessors, who have either rendered portions only (A. Cowley's *Old Man of Verona* is probably the best known of these attempts), or else (A. Hawkins, 1817) have failed completely, have chosen verse as the medium. From a purely literary point of view (Claudian is also an important source for the history of his times) this choice was sound. For our poet is one of those who lose incalculably if they are stripped of their verse. The Honourable H. Howard (1844) is as lax a translator as you will find, even at the present day. But to readers who depend on translations his version of the beginning of the Fescennine Song II.—

Age cuncta nuptiali
redimita uere tellus
celebra toros eriles;
omne nemus cum fluuiis,
omne canat profundum.

Ligures fauete campi,
Veneti fauete montes,
subitisque se rosetis
uestiat Alpibus apex,
et rubeant pruinæ.

'Let earth be drest in her gaudy vest,
Her nuptial robe of spring.
Let every wood and every flood
And the depths of ocean sing.

'Liguria's vale our bridal hail,
Venetian hills be glad,
And red be the snow on yon Alpine brow,
With sudden roses clad.'

will say more than this prose rendering:

'Come, earth, wreathed about with nuptial
spring, do honour to thy master's feast. Sing,
woods and rivers all, sing, deep of ocean. Give
your blessing, too, Ligurian plains and yours,
Venetian hills. Let Alpine heights on a sudden
clothe themselves with rose-bushes, and the
fields of ice grow red.'

This being granted, Mr. Platnauer's translation has to be judged, not as an adequate reproduction of the original, but as a means and aid towards its comprehension and appreciation. The Loeb Classical Library is a collection of unquestioned utility. But its translators, like others, are not always masters of their craft, of whose difficulty

and responsibilities they have not so very seldom but a dim perception. We find them, then, substituting explanation for translation, expatiating in paraphrase, seeking relief from baldness in inappropriate ornament. These weaknesses are not inconspicuous in Mr. Platnauer's *Claudian*. The verse of the 'praegloriosissimus poeta,' as the inscription under his statue called him, is equable in its terseness, polish, and distinction. Whether his last translator can be trusted to convey a sense of this to readers a few extracts may show. I leave them without comment and with but a few italics.

Panegyric on Probinus and Olybrius, 109:

semirutæ turres auulsaque moenia fumant.

'The smoke of towers *o'erthrown* and *ruined*
fortresses ascends to heaven.'

lb. 237 ff.:

quid protulit æquum
falsus olor, ualido quamuis decernere caestu
nouerit et ratibus saeuas arcere procellas?

'Did that false swan beget a child to rival
them, though 'tis true his sons could fight with
the heavy glove and save ships from cruel
tempests?'

Against Rufinus, I. 146:

noui quo Thessala cantu
eripiat lunare iubar.

'I have learned the incantations wherewith
Thessalian witches *pull down the bright moon*.'

Against Eutropius, I. 481:

en alio laedor grauiore Pothino
et patior maius Phario scelus.

'Behold I suffer from a worse than Pothinus
and bear a wrong more flagrant than that of
which Egypt was once the scene.'

Minor Poems, XXV. 70:

cunabula prima puellæ
Danuuius ueteresque Tomi.

'The bride first saw the light in the old city
of Tomi by the mouth of the Danube.'

Contrast lb. 108:

ereptis obmutuit unda querellis (four Latin
words).

'*Quiet* are those waters now that the birds'
plaintive notes resound there no more.'

Rape of Proserpine, III. 99:

tantum | unica despicior? ['Thy only
daughter and so much misprized!']

'Didst thou hold me so cheap *for that* I am
thy sole daughter?'

Ib. 115:

reuocat tandem custodia cari
pignoris et cunctis obiecti fraudibus anni.

'The duty of protecting my dear daughter calls me back after so long an absence; for she is of an age that is exposed to many dangers.'

A climax is reached in *Minor Poem*, VI.—*Rimanti telum ira facit* [Verg. *Aen.* 7. 508]:

In iaculum, quodcumque gerit, dementia mutat.
omnibus armatur rabies. pro cuspidē ferri
cuncta uolant, dum dextra ferox in uulnera
saeuit,

pro telo geritur quidquid suggesserit ira.

'Anger affords a weapon to him who seeks one.'

'Whate'er it carries, that rage converts into a weapon. Wrath supplies all with arms. When an angry man thirsts for blood, anything will serve him for a spear. Fury turns a stick into a cudgel.'

On isolated inaccuracies I have neither space nor wish to dwell. Some of them I hardly understand: *Panegyric of Probinus and Olybrius* 188, 'sword' for *tela* (of the arrows with which Apollo killed the Python) in

spite of the *praefatio* to *Rufinus* I.; *Rufinus* I. 210 f., *fulgentibus . . . toris*, 'glittering bedsteads'; *Stilicho* II. 215, *tenera—nare*, 'subtle scent.' In *ib.* 90, by a species of error, not uncommon in the Loeb Library, *redundantes* (Koch) is printed, but *renidentes* translated. This will not explain 'Danube' for 'Hebri' in the poem on the sixth consulship of Honorius, 108.

The studies of predecessors on his author have been diligently regarded by Mr. Platnauer. In the lack of a proper commentary on Claudian the two volumes, with their notes and introductions, will be a useful aid to our students, especially to such as care for him only as a source. And this increases our regret that in the translation the poet has been lowered to the level at which the critical estimate of the translator would place him. For 'even as a poet,' writes Mr. Platnauer (with Gibbon's judgment before him), 'Claudian is not always despicable.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

INSCRIPTIONS LATINES DE L'ALGÉRIE.

Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie. Tome premier: *Inscriptions de la Proconsulaire.* Recueillies et publiées par STÉPHANE GSELL, Professeur au Collège de France. One vol. Folio. Pp. xvi+458. One map. Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion (Edouard Champion), 1922. 200 frs.

THE Government of Algeria has undertaken a republication of the Latin inscriptions discovered within its boundaries, and the volume before us is the first instalment. Presumably the Government of Tunisia will follow suit, but no hint of this is given. The first volume contains the inscriptions (numbering over 4,000) of a triangular strip of eastern Algeria, that belonged, partly from the outset, partly from a later date, to Africa proconsularis. There are three volumes to follow, and it is hoped that the work will be completed in about ten years. The name of the editor is a guarantee of fine scholarship, both on the epigraphic and the historical side, and expectations are not disappointed.

For the Latin (often cumbrous Latin) of the *Corpus* French is substituted. This is intelligible enough from more than one point of view, and the substitution of a language so widely known does no disservice to the cause of international scholarship. The plan of the *Corpus* is in general followed. The format is the traditional folio. The choice may be regretted. Folios are very unwieldy, and a smaller page would have been quite feasible. We may also regret that, as a rule, printer's type has had to be used for the reproduction of the texts; but the editor explains that any other process would have been far too expensive, and he promises to consider, when the publication is completed, the possibility of issuing an album of selected texts photographed from the original or from impressions. The type is, however, varied enough to permit the reproduction of ligatures in all but very rare combinations. The editor has wisely adhered on the whole to the arrangement of inscriptions which the *Corpus* has made familiar, but he

departs from it in grouping all epitaphs together instead of taking out of the sepulchral series those relating to magistrates, officials, and soldiers. The new grouping is more logical, but we may doubt if it is more useful.

For inscriptions which appear in the *Corpus* the editor refrains from giving an individual bibliography, and contents himself with a general bibliography for each town or district, while making special reference to publications where the epigraphic text is reproduced by other than typographical means. Scholars will heartily approve his system of indicating the exact or approximate number of missing letters by pairs of oblique strokes, and also his decision to abbreviate the record of the various readings of copyists by omitting them (except where letters may have perished since) when he has himself revised the text, and in other cases by mentioning only such variants as cannot be absolutely set aside. Transcriptions, complete or partial, of the epigraphic texts, with explanation of abbreviations, are more liberally provided than in the Berlin publication (which is unduly sparing in this respect), regard being had to the probable needs of scholars who are not specialists in epigraphy, but whose work entails the use of Latin inscriptions. The editor has decided to index each volume, though he recognises that this will be a disadvantage when all four volumes are published. The practical epigraphist will regret the absence of an index of *notabilia varia*, which is a useful feature of the *Corpus*.

Professor Gsell has done his work admirably. For accuracy, conciseness,

clarity, and sound judgment the volume is a model. In going through the four thousand odd texts which it contains I have found little to criticise. The commentaries are as brief as possible, giving as a rule only the explanations and references essential for the direct interpretation of the inscriptions. Occasionally, perhaps, they are a trifle too brief. An inscription like No. 1223, the epitaph of a *miles cohortis X urbanae, optio centuriae, signifer, fisci curator, optio ab actis urbi*, seems to require some comment beyond references to the similar career of a soldier of another urban cohort and to a *proc. Aug. ab actis urbis*. Another instance of over-compression is the description of Melitene as 'ville d'Arménie,' which is not applicable to the earlier centuries. We must confess also to a dislike of such transcriptions as 'eeqq(uitum) Rr(omanorum)' or 'dddd(ominorum) nnnn(ostrorum).' But there is little that one would wish altered, and there are many interesting things to be found, in this excellent *Recueil*. Attention may be drawn to the view expressed on p. 286, based on de Pachtère's observations, that Thèveste did not become the permanent quarters (*castra hiberna*) of the Third Legion till the later years of Vespasian; and to the commentary on No. 3950, dealing with the career of Sentius Caecilianus, boundary commissioner with Rutilius Gallicus in Africa and afterwards Legate of Numidia, about which wrong conclusions have been drawn in the past, and have been used in recent years to support a proposed solution of the problem of Quirinius' government of Syria.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

THE COINAGE OF THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE.

Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum. Vol. I.: Augustus to Vitellius. By H. MATTINGLY, M.A. Pp. ccxxxi+464, 64 plates. London: British Museum and elsewhere, 1923. £3 3s.

EVERYTHING, it is said, comes to him that waits. The trouble is the waiting, but the patience of the student of the Roman Empire is at last rewarded by

the appearance of this first-rate account of the coinage from Augustus to Vitellius. The volume will whet his appetite, but he must resign himself to a further period of waiting. The catalogue includes descriptions (and even reproductions) of many important coins not represented in the Museum collection, and thus it forms a very complete work of reference. Mr. Mattingly's

descriptions have been collated with the originals by the Keeper of the Department, and the reader may rest assured of their accuracy. The catalogue is prefaced by a long Introduction dealing with every subject, technical and historical, raised by the coins. It is a most valuable and welcome piece of work. It falls naturally into two parts: (1) a general account of the Imperial coinage, its origin and development, the monetary system, the circulation of coins (a subject not yet worked out), the countermarks authorising the extension or continuance of the circulation, the types and legends in their general aspect, and so forth; and (2) a detailed study of the issues of each reign, attribution to different mints, and chronology (subjects much studied in recent years), style, and types. The value of the book is much enhanced by sixty-four excellent collotype plates and by those full indices that we expect in British Museum publications. The volume is indispensable to all serious students of the early Empire.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Mattingly for the care which he has devoted to the historical side of the subject. As objects of art, Roman coins do not bear comparison with Greek, though the portraiture — sometimes idealised and beautiful, oftener realistic — is not without appeal to the artist. But their historical testimony is of high importance. It bears out the evidence of the literary sources (no small gain), and recent research has produced some interesting confirmations of our modern conceptions of the policy of the Emperors. The way in which Augustus dealt with the coinage question furnishes one example more of his masterly diplomacy. His intention was to provide gold and silver currency for the Roman world without trenching brusquely on the Senate's right of minting. His method was to strike the money, not at Rome, but in his provinces, in accordance with the practice of *imperatores* since Sulla's time; and Lugdunum was finally established in 15 B.C. as the one imperial mint. The mint at Lugdunum thus assumes an importance which has not hitherto been realised. The Senatorial mint at Rome continued to issue

gold and silver in small quantities for seven years, but from 12 B.C. its issues were confined to *aes*, token money (brass and copper). The developments under Augustus' successors reflect exactly their character and policy. While the cautious Tiberius adhered in the main to the arrangements of Augustus, Caligula with his autocratic temperament transferred the mint to Rome, a change for which there was doubtless much to be said. In the early years of Nero the resuscitation of Senatorial influence finds its expression in the legend *Ex S. C.* stamped almost invariably on the gold and silver of the period. Later a branch of the Senatorial mint was actually opened at Lugdunum to provide small change for the West, but the control of Senatorial finance had already passed into the Emperor's hands.

The ephemeral developments in coinage which followed Nero's fall are clearly set forth by Mr. Mattingly. They strikingly illustrate, as he says, 'the importance of coinage in the Roman Empire for the purposes of propaganda.' But the interpretation of the propaganda is not always quite simple. Mr. Mattingly, for example, interprets the coin types and legends as showing that the revolt of Vindex aimed at the restoration of the Republic (pp. lxxiv, cxvii) — a view which Mommsen maintained to the end. This is not proved by numismatic (or other) evidence any more than a similar aim is proved by the Spanish issues of Galba, about which we read that they clearly stamp the movement in Spain as 'patriotic, Republican, and liberal,' though we also find that Galba 'was only debarred by constitutional scruples from accepting the Imperial title.' Are we also to say that when the legions of Mainz revolted against Galba and swore allegiance to *S.P.Q.R.*, they were out for the restoration of the Republic? They were only showing that the lesson in constitutional procedure administered to them by Verginius Rufus was not wholly lost on them (*Tac. Hist. I. 12, 55*). Few, however, will doubt that Mr. Mattingly is right in attributing to the revolt of the Gauls in alliance with Civilis the very

ran
p.
in
leg
'L
s
oth
wei
the
gen
tion
tha
terr
the
jud
in
whi
met
non
Dr.
to l

Cato
G
V
br
THE
owes
fami
coin
publ
the f
edito
Chri
prov
coin
Num
thoro
TH
inclu
Dr.
great
impo
work
Gros
colle
the r
the y
Mr.
man
Tude
they
weig
the r
NO

rare aurei and denarii described on p. 308, including the striking denarius in Sir Arthur Evans' collection with legends 'Adsertor libertatis' and 'Legion. XV primigenia' (cp. p. cc f.).

Space permits us to refer only to one other point. Nero's reduction of the weight of the aureus and denarius and the debasement of the latter have generally been regarded as a depreciation of the currency. While recognising that Nero's action opened the way to terrible abuses, Mr. Mattingly regards the change as probably in itself a judicious readjustment, owing to a rise in the price of the precious metals, which made the coins worth more as metal than as currency. He will have none of the view of Soutzo, adopted by Dr. Henderson, that the purpose was to harmonise the Roman and Greek

coinages. The fact that this had been done long before made the view unacceptable from the start, and the observation that the Eastern issues were correspondingly reduced in weight gives the theory its quietus.

A word on a few minor matters. The printing of *as* and *asses* (both English words with very different meaning) in Roman type is irritating. 'Burrhus' and 'Rhaetia' are false spellings. 'M. Agrippa' occurs in three places. 'Asia Minor' is used several times where 'Asia' (in the Roman sense) appears to be meant: 'the province of Asia Minor' is a novelty. *Iunoni Liviae sacrum* does not mean that Livia is honoured under the name of Iuno. But in a work of such detail the wonder is that oversights are so few.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

CATALOGUE OF THE McCLEAN COLLECTION.

Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins. By S. W. GROSE.

Vol. I. Pp. x+380, 111 plates. Cambridge University Press, 1923. £4 4s. THE Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge owes to the liberality of the McClean family a magnificent collection of Greek coins, together with the means for due publication of them. The present is the first volume of the Catalogue. The editor is Mr. S. W. Grose, Tutor of Christ's College, who has already proved by his Catalogue of the Balliol coins, as well as by articles in *The Numismatic Chronicle*, that he is a thoroughly accomplished numismatist.

The last great group of numismatists, including Mr. Head, M. Babelon, and Dr. Imhoof Blumer, has done work of great value by insisting on the historic importance of Greek coins, and broadly working out their connexions. Mr. Grose tells us that Mr. McClean also collected on these lines. But perhaps the most striking feature of the work of the younger school, such as, in England, Mr. G. F. Hill, Mr. Grose, and Mr. Seltman; in Germany, Mr. Regling and Mr. Tudeer—is the intensive way in which they work. They study not only the weights and the dates of coins, but also the relations of the dies with which they

were struck, their comparative frequency, their minute peculiarities. In the same way Greek vases have been worked out by writers like Beazley and Hoppin with more minute accuracy than ever before. There can be no doubt that such spadework is valuable, and gives us fresh data; but at the same time it would be unfortunate if the broad historic point of view were neglected: Babelon and I are doing what we can to maintain it.

Mr. Grose gives us, in the case of nearly all coins, what he calls the metal axis—that is, the relation in direction between obverse and reverse. He also minutely compares them with other published examples, citing for the purpose not only great collections, but even the sale-catalogues of recent years. He tries to ascertain the exact history of the dies used, and how long they went on after they were cracked. He is less successful in tracing coins to particular finds: but here the difficulties are enormous, since finds are seldom adequately published, and have been constantly dispersed or added to. It is a blessing to know that the American Numismatic Society now contemplates a full account of these hoards.

This first volume of the Catalogue

includes the coins of Italy and Sicily. The plates will be of the greater value because the corresponding volumes of the British Museum Catalogue have no plates, only a few inadequate woodcuts. An eye accustomed to the cabinets of the national collection feels at once in looking at the McClean plates a certain inequality, since the coins in the British Museum are from collections which were so picked and picked that anything below a certain level of beauty or preservation was apt to be eliminated. Yet the degree of beauty revealed in these plates is very great, and a wonderful testimony to Greek taste even in little things.

Perhaps the greatest desideratum now for Greek numismatics is an orderly historic survey of the coins of the Greek cities of South Italy. None of the works on the subject at present available is satisfactory. Carelli and Garrucci are unscientific. Babelon, in his great *Traité*, has at present as regards Italy

only come down to the Persian Wars. Sir Arthur Evans' work on the coins of Tarentum, and Dr. Regling's on those of Terina, show what might be done. Mr. Grose's notes on the dates of Italian issues are careful and accurate, but not fully explained. A complete collation of city with city is needed; and it would probably throw much light on both Greek and Roman history.

In making his Catalogue, Mr. Grose had no opportunity for the detailed discussion of classes of coins, however interesting. This necessary defect he has compensated by adding in articles in *The Numismatic Chronicle* (1915-17) excellent dissertations on series which attracted his attention. This is just the way in which the compiling of catalogues tends to the increase of knowledge. The compiler is sure to find difficulties, and in solving them he secures an admirable training for himself and cuts steps up the slope for his successors.

P. GARDNER.

LATIN PROSE RHYTHM.

Latin Prose Rhythm. By H. D. BROADHEAD. Pp. 137. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1922. 15s.

THE author of this work was educated in New Zealand, where he took the degree of B.A. He then went to Cambridge, became a Scholar of Trinity, and resided there for three years. After his return to New Zealand he became Lecturer at Canterbury University College. The present dissertation was submitted as an exercise for the degree of D.Litt. in the University of New Zealand. The Antipodes, therefore, may with justice look on him as their alumnus.

Dr. Broadhead claims to have followed 'a new method of investigation' in dealing with this difficult subject. He tells us that he owes his first interest in the matter to the 'inspiring works' of Zielinski. He is now, however, in acute, though respectfully expressed, revolt against his early master. He rejects Zielinski's theory of the recurrent cretic, present in some shape or other in all clausulae;¹ he

impugns his statistics, as founded upon false assumptions, and charges him with neglect of the accent as an essential factor in prose rhythm. He also disagrees with Zander's views on the subject of word-ictus and *rhythmici congruens iteratio*,² while he says of de Groot³ that 'he ignores entirely any sense-groups, and so neglects that which alone makes speech intelligible and rhythm possible.'

The author's main object is 'to show that, so far as Latin Prose is concerned, accent is an essential element in the production of rhythm' (p. 37). This contention appears most reasonable, and probably few persons would dispute it as thus stated. Zielinski himself, whose position in the matter is somewhat imperfectly stated in ch. v., continually emphasises the importance of accent, and his efforts to reconcile accent with quantity have led him to his theory of a 'shifting accent' which has been so much criticised. Of recent years the opinion (shared by the present

¹ *Class. Rev.* XIX. (1905), pp. 164-172.

² *Class. Rev.* XXX. (1916), pp. 53-55.

³ *Class. Rev.* XXXIV. (1920), pp. 42-45.

reviewer) has been steadily growing that accent plays a more important part than was previously realised in the production of prose rhythm, and that further examination of the subject from this point of view is likely to be fruitful. We are, however, met with a difficulty at the outset, since the character of the Latin accent is disputed. If it was one of stress, a view held strongly by Broadhead and apparently essential to his system, all is clear. We cannot, however, ignore the fact that a number of competent judges deny this and consider it to have been one of pitch, as in Greek.

The gist of Broadhead's book is to be found in chh. iii. and v., from which statements may be extracted with occasional comments. We are told (p. 40) that the primary rhythmical feet are 'cretic, spondee (with the resolved forms, *i.e.* anapaest and dactyl), trochee (with its resolved form, *i.e.* tribrach), and iambus (including, at the end of the word, pyrrhich).' The omission of 'resolutions' after 'cretic' seems due to accident, since later on (pp. 73 ff.) resolutions of the cretic appear in cretic combinations. On p. 45 we find 'a set of symbols by which combinations of feet can be designated as succinctly as possible. . . . By Zielinski the *L*, *M*, *S*, and *P* classes are all regarded as variations of the *Integrationsclausel*; in our system every foot is given its own symbol. Thus, to take the primary feet first. *C* stands for cretic, *S* for spondee, *T* for trochee, *I* for iambus; but when the final foot of a kolon is a trochee (or spondee) I use the number 2, but when it is a cretic or dactyl I use the number 3. . . . Thus *vultus ferre possemus* is *SC 2*, *omnes postulant* is *S 3*, *copias comparavit* is *CT 2*.' At this point the reader will inquire what is included in the clausula. We are told (p. 68): 'A simple description of my method is this—I record what are the last two feet of the period, except where the antepenultimate foot is of vital importance.' This method of determining the length of the clausula is said to be analogous to that stated by de Groot, though there are certain differences.

We now come to the question of 'secondary' feet. In such combina-

tions as *omnēs cognōscūnt*, *cōnsūlēs cognōscūnt* we have an unaccented syllable (*cog-*) between the primary foot (*S* or *C*) and the two final syllables. Broadhead calls this an *Anlaufsilbe*, which 'may not only form part of a primary foot, but may follow upon a word that ends in such a primary foot' (p. 43). The secondary feet are given on p. 46, and the symbols are said to be 'equally simple,' a statement which the reader may question. Thus, to take the first class: 'If a cretic is followed by a short *Anlaufsilbe* (e.g. *cōnsūlēs ādēscent*) the resulting foot is denoted by the symbol *D* (as a help to the memory cp. Dichoreus); if the *Anlaufsilbe* is long (e.g. *cōnsūlēs āudistis*) the symbol is *E*.' The secondary feet are succeeded by an awe-inspiring phantom, described as *U*. This 'represents one long accented syllable that does not make part of a foot, e.g. *Mil. 46, ēvānt pērmūlti ālŕi*,' which is described as *BU 2*¹. Here *ēvānt pēr* = *B*, a secondary foot formed of an iambic + a long *Anlaufsilbe*, *multi* (-i elided) = *U*, and *ālŕi* is a resolution for a long syllable. It may be truly said that, if Zielinski chastises his readers with whips, Broadhead chastises his with scorpions.

Zielinski ingeniously used the first letters of the Greek alphabet to represent the types, *i.e.* the caesura divisions in the clausula. Thus in his Form 1 (—o—o—), if there is no caesura at all, the type is *α*; if the caesura comes after the first long it is *β*; if after the second syllable, it is *γ*, and if after the third syllable, *δ*. Broadhead says that he has retained this convenient mode of marking caesuras by Greek letters, 'which, however, appear in English form.' He drops Zielinski's *β* type (e.g. *non oportere*) on the ground that many of the examples are doubtful. His types, therefore, are *a*, *g*, *d*, which seems awkward, since in English *d* comes before *g*, not after it, as in Greek.

It is interesting to compare the results arrived at by the new method with those of Zielinski. On pp. 69 ff. tables are given to show the relative frequency of the principal combinations of two feet. The most frequent are said to be:

- (1) T 2 (-o-o).
- (2) C 2 (-o--o).
- (3) C 3 (-o--o^u).
- (4) I 2 (o--o).

Of these T 2 is the double trochee which, when provided with a cretic base, becomes Zielinski's Form 3 (-o--o-o); C 2 is Zielinski's Form 1; C 3 is Zielinski's Form 2; and I 2, if provided with a previous long syllable, also falls under Zielinski's Form 1. The results, therefore, do not differ widely, except that the double trochee comes at the head of the list.

The author proceeds to discuss the various combinations, e.g. cretic, spondaic, etc. Thus ten forms of cretic combinations (C 2, C 3) are found to exist when resolutions are taken into account. Ch. vi. deals with what Zielinski terms the 'pervading rhythm' of the sentence,¹ and is based on an analysis of four speeches of Cicero. This is followed by elaborate tables recording the frequency of the various combinations, which it must have taken enormous labour to construct. Thus 66 varieties of C combinations and 95 of S are given, while finally, after other heads have been similarly dealt with, we have a final list of 218 'rare forms which are noteworthy only for their infrequency.'

The subject dealt with in this work is so technical and complicated that the discussion must necessarily be somewhat bewildering, even to those who have made some study of the points involved. Broadhead does not write for beginners, but assumes that his readers are acquainted with the literature of the subject, often using technical terms borrowed from Zielinski and others, without explanation. His new symbols are only given once (pp. 45-46), and he assumes that his readers have then mastered them and are capable of carrying them in their heads when they come to chh. v. and vi. It would be much clearer if, when he is discussing new forms and combinations, the metrical equivalents were given. Also, he rarely quotes passages, but only gives figures to show the frequency of

various sequences. Lastly, there is no index.

There are two subjects in which Broadhead does not appear to be much interested. One of these is *concininitas*, i.e. the use of antithetical clauses of equal length and concluded by *ὁμοιοτέλευτα*. The ancients ascribed the invention of *concininitas* to Gorgias and that of *numeri* to Thrasymachus. Cicero tells us that prose rhythm does not consist of *numeri* only, but also of *concininitas*, and that the rhythm sometimes consists of this alone.² This is the modicum of truth which underlies Zander's theory of rhythm as consisting of *congruens iteratio*. There are occasions when an ending, which is otherwise insoluble, is at once explained by *concininitas*. Thus in *Mil.* 73 we have one of Cicero's long sentences, in which every *κόμμα* and *κῶλον* exhibits a well-marked *numerus* of the ordinary kind with the solitary exception of six words, viz. *nec in faciendū nec in libidinē*, which under Zielinski's system defy analysis. Broadhead regards *nec in libidine* as an example of what he terms A 3 (A = iambic + *Anlaufsilbe*), but adds that this is the only occasion where A 3 occurs. The rhythm here depends on the balance of *ισόκωλα* ended by homoeoteleuton, not on any final *numerus*. In order to avoid monotony, Cicero plucks an arrow from the quiver of Gorgias.

The second subject concerns the evidence furnished by the mediaeval *cursus*. Various writers have shown that Zielinski's three chief Forms are found in Greek as well as in Latin, and were finally stereotyped in the *cursus*. The rules of the *cursus* are established beyond dispute. If we take Form 1 (-o--o), e.g. *μηδὲ τοξεύη, morte vicistis* in connexion with the *cursus planus* in which the accents are in the same place, it would seem obvious that in all cases where this rhythm occurs we have the same *numerus*. If so, it is hard to understand why Broadhead (p. 45) styles *voltus ferre possemus* SC 2 and (p. 115) treats *in re publica bona esse visuros* as SdC 2. Why does he not call them C 2 (= Zielinski's 1 γ, and

¹ *Class. Rev.* XXX. (1916), pp. 22-26.

² *Orator*, §§ 164, 181, 202, etc.

cursus planus)? This would seem more natural, especially in view of his statement (p. 69) that his usual practice is to take the last two feet of the period.

These criticisms are not made in any hostile spirit, but are intended as a tribute to an able and original piece of

work, which deserves to hold a high place among recent publications on the subject with which it deals. It is likely to produce much discussion, and the author is well able to defend himself against those who disagree with him.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

THE HISTORY OF HISTORY.

An Introduction to the History of History (Records of Civilisation: Sources and Studies). By JAMES T. SHOTWELL, PH.D. Pp. xii + 334. Columbia University Press; Oxford University Press, 1922. Cloth, 17s. net.

THIS book is designed to be the introductory volume of a new series to be issued under the general title of *Records of Civilisation: Sources and Studies*. The series, which is already represented by Professors Botsford's and Sihler's *Hellenic Civilisation*, is to include both historical source-books and works of critical interpretation embodying the results of modern scholarship. The original design of the present volume has been modified, and while the purely introductory chapters remain, the sections dealing with ancient history, Jewish, Greek, Roman and Christian, have been expanded into a general survey which now occupies the greater part of the book. A brief review of medieval and modern interpretations of history has been added as a final chapter, pending the publication of a further volume covering those periods.

In a prefatory note of disarming modesty, Professor Shotwell apologises to the classicist for invading his field. But few will feel disposed to quarrel with him for his undertaking. He has brought to the task a fine mastery of his material, together with a scholarly detachment and—in general—an admirable sense of historical perspective. Himself an enthusiast for modern scientific method, he distinguishes with clearness and impartiality the artistic and individual element in history as a literary product from the scientific and social element involved in the process of historical research. It is indeed the latter which chiefly interests him, and this is perhaps inevitable, inasmuch as

the achievements of the spirit have little traceable development in time, while the apparatus of criticism shares the steadily progressive character of all scientific invention, and offers a straightforward track to the historian of history. But he seems at times to assign undue importance to mechanism and material forces (as in the misleading statement that 'machinery incorporates thought in its materials, just as marble bears the impress of a sculptor's imagination'); and he might with advantage have made it clearer that the present day concentration on economic forces is not more likely to unlock every secret of history than those other partial means of interpretation in the past whose discovery, application and supersession he has brilliantly sketched in the final chapter.

As it is, the classicist will find some hard, if salutary, sayings among the conclusions to which he is led. It is no doubt true, from the point of view of scientific historical research, that 'upon the whole, we have almost nothing to learn from antique interpretations of history. . . . They are of no service to us in our own interpretations.' And the explanation given is no doubt the correct one: 'A political man is the furthest analysis one gets. But even Aristotle never knew how many things there were in politics besides politics.' But Professor Shotwell finds it easier to forgive the Old Testament historians for their deficient standard of truth, his defence of which is an admirable lesson in historical perspective, than to forgive Thucydides for being ignorant of economics and for refusing to portray the everyday social life of Athens. He is indeed somewhat less than kind to Thucydides, towards whom he seems to feel something of the anger

of an admirer who sees the greatness of opportunities thrown away. At first sight there seems in this something paradoxical, but really it is the natural protest of the scientific historian against those extravagant claims which, as he says, reveal rather the scientific limitations of their authors than the scientific triumphs of Thucydides. For the rest, his analysis of Thucydides' shortcomings (on the scientific side) is very ably done; but it is neither quite fair nor quite accurate to say of him that (instead of describing the Athens of his time) 'he chose to hand down as part of an everlasting possession to future ages instructions for our Von Moltkes, Kuropatkins, Joffres and Ludendorffs, in the handling of spearmen on foraging campaigns.' Such a sentence is unworthy of the book as a whole, and of the candid and genial critic which Professor Shotwell shows himself to be. Of Herodotus he is charmingly appreciative (he might, by the way, have brought up to date

his parallel with the Franco-Prussian war), and the studies of Polybius, Livy, and Tacitus are fair-minded and discriminating.

The book is provided with valuable bibliographies, and is written in a lucid and vigorous style, which adds much to its attractiveness, in spite of an occasional oversight ('logi' on p. 250 is an unlucky misprint), and some embarrassment caused by the nomenclature of the subject. It is unfortunate that no better alternative has been found for 'the history of history' than the respectable but unattractive 'historiography,' the full possibilities of which are revealed by such a phrase as 'the history of the philosophy of Greek historiography.' And there is less still to be said for 'unhistoricity.' But these are small blemishes, and do not affect the value of a book that is scholarly, illuminating, and scarcely ever dull—a suggestive and stimulating introduction to its subject.

E. W. V. CLIFTON.

TWO SCANDINAVIAN MISCELLANIES.

Symbolae Arctoeae. Fasc. I. edidit Societas Philologica Christianiensis. Typis excudit A. W. BRÖGGER in aed. H. Erichsen et Soc. Christianiae MDCCCXXII. Pp. 86. Paper.

Strena Philologica Upsaliensis. Festschrift tillägnad Professor PER PERSSON på hans 65-årsdag, Nyårsaften 1922. Pp. vii+416, with a photograph. Upsala: Edv. Berlings Boktryckeri A.-B. Paper.

SUMMARY justice is the meed of composite and polyglot books.

In the Norwegian volume the classical reader will find G. Rudberg's 'Neuplatonismus und Politik,' an essay in German on the attitudes of later philosophers, especially Plotinus, towards the questions which led to Plato's *Laws*; discussions by S. P. Thomas in Latin of the Augustan *census senatorius*, of *consulares legere* in Livy II. 18, of *nunc* in Cic. *de Rep.* II. 22, and of Festus on *negritu*; a minute analysis by R. Ullmann, in French, of Pindar's use of the article; and a long paper by E. Smith, in Danish (or is it Norse?), on the meanings of *Ἀργος* in Homer. The

author, who is versed in recent English writings on Homer, decides that *Ἀργος* has two meanings, to which *Ἰάσον* *Ἀργος* might add a third if we knew what it meant: (1) a kingdom in Thes-saly, where was the home of Achilles; (2) a kingdom, ruled by the Attridae, in the Peloponnese, including Lacedaemon and Messene, Argolis, Corinthia, Sicyon, and Achaia. He would connect the word with *regnum* and *Reich*.

So much, or so little, for the book of 86 pages; and what for the book of 416? The Upsala tributes to Professor Persson are couched in Swedish, Latin, German, French. How many libraries in our countries will buy this volume? How many English-speakers will buy it for what they can read? And how many will learn Swedish for the rest? To whom have offprints been sent? The neighbour of mine who has done most for the text of Sophocles has not received a copy of the first chapter, O. A. Danielsson's acute and instructive criticisms of some difficulties in the *O.R.*; nor could I do justice to them in a sentence or a paragraph. The

reviewer of such a book must needs become a cataloguer, and a curser of the Tower of Babel; and even his catalogue must be selective and little *raisonné*.

Let S, L, G, F denote the four languages.

G. Rudberg (L) dates Xen. *Symp.* after Pl. *Symp.* and *Phaedr.*, which belongs in his opinion to 366. E. Staaff (S) makes *aerarius* mean 'liable to military service,' and equates *tribuni aerarii* with *tr. mil.* C. Theander (G) vamps the *σπασιωτικά* of Alcaeus. H. Hagendahl (G) expounds or emends Ammianus. J. Samuelsson (S) examines how far Horace avoids like endings in consecutive words; G. Sandsjöe (S) etymologises about *véwota*, O. Lagercrantz (L) about *fortuitu*, *omnino*, and *uicissim*. M. P. Nilsson (G) derives the precaesarian calendar from the end of the regal period. H. Sjögren (L) reads in Cic. *ad Att.* VIII. 7. *1 cum habeat praesertim xx ipse cohortes, xxx Domitius*; surely rightly, for *Domitius*, he says, is in M. T. Kalén mends 'Die Bau-

inschrift von Tegea.' A. Gagnér (G) throws light on Roman ways of denoting the day of the month, and finds that in reckoning an interval of time it was usual with ordinals to count in both the first term and the last, but with cardinals only the last. L. Kjellberg (G) will have none of P. N. Ure's defence of Ar. *Aθ.* II. 25. 3 on Themistocles and the Areopagus; and in Cic. *ad Fam.* V. 12 he would read *redituque* <in gratiam regis> *retinetur*. E. Kjellberg (G) discusses the development of the Theseus legend. A. Boëthius gives a long article (G) on the topography of Dorian Argos, with photographs and a map. V. C. Lindström (L) dilates upon the trochaic systems of Plautus. V. Lundström (S) argues that the Augustan *Chalcidicum* was replaced by the *Atrium Mineruae* of Domitian, who built also a temple to *Minerua Chalcidica* in the Campus Martius. For E. Lidén on the name *Mosynoikoi* (S) see C.R. XXXVII., p. 106. Lastly, E. Löfstedt (L) derives the uses of *dum* from an original meaning 'now.' E. HARRISON.

LINDSAY'S EARLY LATIN VERSE.

Early Latin Verse. By W. M. LINDSAY, F.B.A. One vol. 8vo. Pp. 372+12. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. £1 8s.

A BIG book by Professor Lindsay on the scansion of the extant verse of the early period of Latin literature (not much about Saturnians) is an event of great importance to all editors of texts and advanced students generally. They will have to study every word in it, and take their bearings to the author's doctrine on a multitude of complicated questions of prosody, phonetics, and textual criticism. But this book makes a wider appeal. It claims to have disclosed for the first time the intonation of Latin speech as heard in the days of Plautus and Terence, and by inference in those of Cicero—'the tone of utterance that breathes life into the dry bones of language' (Preface, p. vii)—and to have effected this by clearing away 'the rubbish of half a century.' Professor Lindsay makes a pretty clean sweep of the views of his predecessors, including the Teubner editors, Leo,

Klotz, Müller, Ritschl, to say nothing of others. What, then, is the new gospel which is 'to restore order and harmony among lovers of Plautus' (p. ix)? With the details of Plautine criticism the ordinary student of Latin is not deeply concerned, especially as they involve the discussion of highly controversial matters on which only the specialist can form an opinion; but the intonation of Latin speech is a matter on which new light should be welcomed by all. It is a pity that Professor Lindsay has not presented any conspectus of his views on this matter; they have to be gathered by the reader from a multitude of passages scattered throughout the book, and I confess that after reading it I am unable to make any definite statement on the subject. One finds little or nothing about 'intonation' in the strict sense of the term, but a great deal about pronunciation, and in particular about a habit of 'slurred pronunciation' (pp. 257-9), due to 'the hurry of utterance,' and involving syncope. No

phonetic account of the process of slurring is attempted; indeed, Professor Lindsay seems deliberately to ignore certain phonetic difficulties to which several writers have called attention. How, for instance, was the word *exprobras* pronounced when the first syllable was 'slurred'? *E-sprobras*? Professor Lindsay does not think it important to know this; one thing alone he asserts, that its first syllable was somehow short in the sentence *Quid exprobras*? as ordinarily pronounced by an educated Roman. This pronunciation would, no doubt, explain the trochaic line which begins with these words (*Trin.* 318). But in another line of Plautus (*Most.* 300) we get *cur exprobras*? pronounced - - - . Was this a mispronunciation? No, replies Professor Lindsay (p. 52); the shortened pronunciation was only an 'alternative'; and he admits that 'we can seldom guess' why the one pronunciation was preferred in some cases and the other in others, any more than we can tell why 'we will' is sometimes reduced to 'we'll' in English. This is hardly illuminating. It simply comes to this, that in hurried speech the Romans somehow slurred long syllables so as to pronounce them short; and it opens the door to almost any licence of this kind. Professor Lindsay does not even call attention to one important limitation to the shortening of initial long syllables, viz. that they must begin with a vowel, e.g. *audivi, annona, argentum, ignoras, indignus, insidiae, invidia, ornatus* (and *ergo, ibo, unus, abstuli, immortalis*), but not, say, *primus, piscator, germanus*: at least we have no evidence for any slurred pronunciation of initial syllables beginning with a consonant. In some cases Professor Lindsay's slurrings involve a still greater difficulty; how could *quodne, nosne, idne* be pronounced as monosyllables without reducing them to *quon, non, in*?

What is the evidence on which Professor Lindsay relies for his slurrings? It is drawn entirely from certain features of Old Latin verse-structure. The verse of comedy in particular is treated as reflecting accurately the pronunciations of everyday speech; and to the proper way of scanning the verse of

comedy Professor Lindsay devotes the bulk of his book. From his preface one might have anticipated that some new law of Old Latin verse-structure was to be launched. Nothing of the kind. It is the old, old story of the 'brevis brevians,' to which Professor Lindsay sits tight, in spite of the criticism with which the law has been assailed from various points of view.¹ In one respect, it is true, Professor Lindsay interprets this 'law of Latin phonetics' (p. 36) differently from most of his predecessors, e.g. Skutsch: he refuses to allow anything to the operation of an 'ictus' or verse-stress, demanding that the 'brevis,' if accented, must carry a word-accent or sentence-accent, and that the 'brevianda' must always be unaccented (p. 40). This restriction is, however, not insisted upon with rigour; for we find that *adoptatitius* is scanned as - - - - - in *Poen.* 1045 (p. 87), though the accentuation must have been *adoptatitius* (cf. *Poen.* 1060);² again *harpagō* is declared to have a shortened *o* under this law (p. 298), though the 'brevis' is wholly unaccented, and the 'brevianda' has a secondary accent, and is followed by a pause which prevents that accent from being overridden by any sentence-accent. (In the Teubner edition, *Trin.* 239a, I see no accent over the second syllable of the word!) I note in passing that Professor Lindsay nowhere formulates a law of the 'brevis brevians': this must be intentional on his part, for several different formulations have been offered by scholars, including himself (*Jahresbericht*, 1895-1905, p. 171), and none of them is even mentioned; the characteristics of the law have to be picked up by the reader as he proceeds.

Whether it is legitimate to infer from the practice of verse-writers to the pronunciations of daily speech is a matter on which opinions may differ.

¹ See *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* for 1920 (dated 1921), p. 79. In a recent review of an article by me (*Classical Philology*, VI. 1), Professor Kauer of Vienna sums up the situation in the words, 'Der Ausdruck *Imbden-Kürzungsgesetz* passt nicht mehr.' See Köhler's *Jahresbericht über Plautus* 1912-20, p. 28.

² How does Professor Lindsay scan *Amph.* 761? He does not tell us.

Skut
decla
infer
speed
in th
1902
Hül
same
sylla
from
apart
that
short
assur
purity
Gree
the c
metre
neces
is rec
Old I
of de
not c
and
disyll
Profe
sight

St. B
JAC
Was
Am
THE q
ture, a
Classi
interes
which
under
the sli
gation,
'only
acquai
the ear
that B
and A
peculia
An int
ance w
course
well-kn
shows
Jacks'
and les
more
favouri
compar
Basil w
that w
true me
fluence
style; t
method

Skutsch, to whom this book is dedicated, declared it to be an error of principle to infer the quantities of vowels in ordinary speech from the syllable-shortenings in the dramatists (*Berliner Phil. Woch.* 1902, p. 1238, in a review of Marx's *Hilfsbüchlein*, Third Edition); and the same thing might be said as to inferring syllable-shortenings in ordinary speech from syllable-shortenings in verse. But, apart from this, it must be observed that the whole doctrine of syllable-shortening in verse rests on a big assumption, viz. that the quantitative purity of the disyllabic rises and falls of Greek verse was maintained intact in the early Latin adaptations of these metres. This assumption becomes unnecessary, if accent as well as quantity is recognised as a structural element in Old Latin verse, leading to a toleration of departures from quantitative purity, not only in the inner falls of iambic and trochaic dipodies, but also in disyllabic rises and falls in any foot. Professor Lindsay comes almost within sight of this when he speaks of the

Roman 'regard for accent' (pp. 28, 317-23, etc.); but he debars himself from carrying this doctrine out to its logical conclusion by his blind insistence on the formula 'Plautine verse is quantitative, not accentual' (pp. 37, 268). I venture to call it 'blind,' because it is obvious on reflection that quantitative structure and accentual structure are not necessarily incompatible; they may go hand in hand, or they may supplement one other. To Professor Lindsay accentual demarcation of rises is a mere ornament in verse; but it may well be something more.¹ If so, the whole doctrine of the 'brevis brevians' falls to the ground as an explanation of the structure of Old Latin verse. As a law of Latin linguistics it may be thoroughly justified: that is an entirely different matter, in which the scope of shortening is far more limited than it is assumed to be in verse under the operation of this law.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

¹ I hope to make a fuller statement on this point in a volume to be entitled *What is Rhythm?*

St. Basil and Greek Literature. By L. V. JACKS (Doctoral dissertation). Pp. v+124. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1922.

THE question of Basil's tastes in Greek literature, and of his knowledge of the different Classical writers, is one of more than stylistic interest, and well deserves the careful study which Mr. Jacks has given to it. Mr. Jacks is under no illusion, in a general way, regarding the slipperiness of the path of 'source investigation,' and he sets out, as he tells us, to trace 'only certain, or nearly certain, signs of an acquaintance with, or attitude of mind towards, the earlier Greek culture.' He is able to show that Basil had read widely and deeply in Plato and Aristotle, and that the former had a peculiar attraction for the Christian theologian. An interesting point is Basil's close acquaintance with Aristotle's biological writings. He of course knew Homer well; but, in spite of his well-known characterisation of Aeschylus, he shows little acquaintance (less even than Mr. Jacks' index would suggest) with Attic tragedy, and less with Attic oratory. Among writers more nearly contemporary with himself, his favourite appears to have been Plutarch. As compared with contemporary pagan writers, Basil was sparing in quotation; he had too much that was original and important to say. The true measure of his Greek education is its influence on the mould of his thought and of his style; to this influence the German-American method of 'source investigation' is not always a

reliable guide. 'University men' like Basil quote and echo many authors whom they have not read.

Even so the method yields instructive results, if applied with judgment and scholarship. Mr. Jacks has occasional lapses from both. On p. 62 he quotes as a reminiscence of Thucydides I. 134, Basil's comparison (*Ep.* 74) of 'the Podandus' (*sic*) to 'the Spartan Ceadas, or any other natural fissure you have seen.' Here the least of his offence is that he transforms a well-known Cappadocian town into a *βάραθρον*; far more serious is his insinuation that Basil had read Thucydides. He *may* have done; the pity is that, on the strength of this and another coincidence, Thucydides will now stand on the 'index of authors quoted by, or connected with, St. Basil' until a less sanguine source-investigator takes the task in hand. Strabo also (p. 73) figures on the list, on the strength of Basil's statement (36A) that 'some regard the Hyrcanian and Caspian seas as forming a land-locked system (*περιγεγράφθαι καθ' αὐτάς*). This is traced to Strabo 507C: *ἡ δὲ δευτέρα μερὶς ἀρχεται μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Κασπίας θαλάττης εἰς ἣν κατέπαιεν ἡ προτέρα. καλεῖται δ' ἡ αὐτὴ θάλαττα καὶ Ὑρκανία . . . ἐστὶ (ἔστι: Jacks) δ' ὁ κόλπος ἀνέχων ἐκ τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ*, which Mr. Jacks translates: 'It is a sea apart from the ocean.' I select these instances to justify the application to this thesis of a description too often applied to American doctoral dissertations, 'a useful collection of material, to be used with discrimination.' The German-American

system which introduces young graduates to work of this sort is admirable; still more admirable would be an efficient supervision of the results as a preliminary to publication.

W. M. CALDER.

THE ROMANS IN BRITAIN.

Caer Llugwy: the Roman Fort between Capel Curig and Bettws-y-Coed. By J. P. HALL. One vol. 10" x 7½". Pp. 64. Frontispiece, 20 plates, 4 plans, and a map. Manchester: Taylor, Garnett, Evans and Co., 1923. 10s. 6d.

The Roman Villa at North Leigh. By M. V. TAYLOR. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 4, with a map, plan, and 2 photographs. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1923. 1s.

SINCE the seventeenth century it has been suspected that Roman remains, styled by various travellers a 'brickwork,' 'Roman building,' 'Roman villa,' existed on the farm Bryn y Gefiliu on the banks of the Llugwy, two miles from Capel Curig. In 1920 excavations undertaken by Mr. J. P. Hall and Captain G. H. Higson revealed an approximately square fort with an area of 3.9 acres. An annexe to the west, measuring roughly 300 feet by 400 feet, was partly opened up, and some stone buildings traced. The result is to prove the existence there of a fort, apparently built 90-100 A.D., which has been named Caer Llugwy by the excavators. This elaborate and expensive book deals with these 'Trial Excavations.' Of the chapters contributed by various writers, the most original is that by Mr. W. J. Hemp on the 'Enviros of the Fort and the Roads.' The map illustrating this attempt to deal with Roman roads in North Wales is the most useful feature of the book. Mr. Howel Williams writes upon 'Ancient Lead Workings,' and the editor, Mr. F. A. Bruton, furnishes an introduction.

Miss Taylor has expanded the late Professor Haverfield's brief description, and included in the plan the details of the excavations of 1910-1911, thus providing a much needed summary of what we know of the North Leigh villa. It is to be hoped that in the near future the excavation of this interesting house will be completed.

J. A. PETCH.

THE OSTINELLI AUXILIA.

LUIGI SCHIAPARELLI *Raccolta di Documenti Latini* (=Auxilia N. 2). Como (Ostinelli), 1923. Pp. xvi + 160. 30 francs.

EVERYONE who visits Italy (and for many of us the other countries of Europe are merely so many avenues through which we can pass to the land we love) knows how keen is the interest of Italians to-day in their glorious past, keener, perhaps, than at any time since the Renaissance. The Paravia series of the Classics (reviewed here in August-September, 1918) is one indication of it. Another is the Ostinelli series, entitled *Auxilia ad Res Italicas Medii Aevi Exquirendas in usum Scholarum instructa et collecta*. The first volume of *Auxilia* was

Professor Schiaparelli's paleographical manual *La Scrittura Latina* (pp. 212; 20 francs; Como, 1921). This is the second. And we are promised a volume by Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna* (1343-1408), from which, I fancy, we shall learn a great deal of the history of MSS. If I remember rightly, the genial author told me recently that it was nearly or quite finished.

This volume, by the Florence Professor of Paleography, selects from inscriptions, papyri, etc., specimens of the formulae used for various acts of law or business: e.g., the purchase of a horse, a house, a slave; manumissions of slaves; military diplomas; wills; receipts, and so on. It is valuable to every student, for—so far as I know—there is no other collection quite like it. And it must be of supreme interest to Italians. We must all congratulate the publishers on having secured the services of so admirable an author.

But I trust that I may be allowed, without giving offence, to remind the author that, while there are other persons in Italy who could do this work (though probably not so well), there is a work which he alone in Italy can do. After Cipolla's death there is no one who is capable of finishing the *Codici Bobbiesi* but Schiaparelli. His admirable monograph on Irish script (*Note Paleografiche*, Florence, 1917) shows that he is the man for this task. And to whom else can we look for a satisfactory treatment of the other Italian scriptoriums, Verona, Vercelli, Novara, Ivrea, etc.? A year ago I should have added Lucca. But fortunately we may hope to see soon his edition (for the Vatican series) of that wonderful MS., No. 490, of the Lucca Cathedral, an edition which, I am told, will include an account of the Lucca scriptorium.

W. M. LINDSAY.

STATIUS IN IRISH.

Togail na Tebe: The Thebaid of Statius. The Irish Text edited from two MSS. With Introduction, Translation, and Notes, by GEORGE CALDER, M.A., B.D., D.Litt. 8vo. Pp. xxiv + 432. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1922. Price 42s.

THIS work will interest such classical scholars as care to see for themselves what happened to a Latin epic in the process of transformation into late mediaeval Irish romance. The result has, as literature, no value whatever; but it is of very considerable importance in the history of the Latinisation of Western Europe, for no Irish literary productions show so clearly as the translations of Vergil, Lucan, Statius, etc., that Irish writers remained almost totally unaffected by the form of Latin literature. Readers who are not acquainted with Irish will be able to satisfy themselves on the point by means of Dr. Calder's translation of the Irish *Thebaid*. They must be warned, however, that the Irish original, though often grotesque enough, is not always really so grotesque as Dr. Calder represents it. 'Female womanly words,' p. 285, or 'to make a huge menace against him,' *ib.*, or "'whither is flight attempted at all,'" said he,' p. 293, and the

like are not quite fair to the translator of the Latin or to the translator of the Irish.

The Editor's excellent design of producing a work that might be useful to learners of Irish has been skilfully countered by the University Press, which has fixed a price for the book that puts it beyond the reach of all but reviewers.

J. FRASER.

TWO PROBLEMS IN AESCHYLUS.

The Problem of the Agamemnon. By E. S. HOERNLE, I.C.S. A Pamphlet. 8vo. Pp. iii+42. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1921. 2s. net.

The Recognition Scene in the Choephoree. By E. S. HOERNLE, I.C.S. A Pamphlet. 8vo. Pp. iii+28. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1922. 2s. net.

In the first of these pamphlets Mr. Hoernle, whose *Notes on the Text of Aeschylus* were recently reviewed in these columns, presents us with a criticism of the late Dr. Verrall's theory of the plot of the *Agamemnon*, a letter of Verrall's in reply, and his own comments on the latter. Verrall had asked the question how the king, who is said to have destroyed the town of Troy before starting for home, could arrive at Argos on the morning after the beacon message which is said to announce its fall. His answer was that Agamemnon never fired the signal at all, and that the beacon seen at Argos did not announce the capture of Troy, but was only stated to do so by Clytaemnestra, in order to cover up a signal arranged with Aegisthus as a means of collecting their adherents at the critical moment of Agamemnon's return. This view is effectively criticised by Mr. Hoernle, and defended by Verrall with his wonted dexterity; but he does not seem to meet the point that, if Clytaemnestra was obliged to account for the beacon, she gratuitously chose the very worst possible explanation—one that exposed her to conviction of falsehood as soon as her husband appeared on the scene. Mr. Hoernle propounds as an alternative view 'that Agamemnon reached Argos *unexpectedly soon*, thereby nearly defeating, and hoping to defeat, the conspirators' aims.' His idea is that Agamemnon suspected the state of affairs at Argos, and did not fire the signal immediately on the capture of Troy, but only after its destruction, on the eve of his departure; that the furious storm in which he was involved carried him with extreme rapidity towards Argos, while at the same time it interrupted the transmission of the signal, which could not be resumed until the succeeding night; and that, owing to this odd conjunction of circumstances, Agamemnon got home nearly as soon as the signal itself. On this ingenious view Verrall comments with fatal effect: 'Why not suppress the news (of the capture) till his actual arrival, and surprise Clytaemnestra even more than he did? Why give her a *short* notice if he need not give her any?' And to this Mr. Hoernle makes no satisfactory reply. If one may venture to say so, both Dr. Verrall and his critic are perhaps mistaken in supposing that Agamemnon is represented as arriving at Argos on the morning after the beacon message.

Some arguments to the contrary, with which Mr. Hoernle appears to be unacquainted, will be found in the introduction to Headlam's *Agamemnon*; and until they are refuted it seems superfluous to decide which is the better way of surmounting a difficulty which may not really exist.

In his second pamphlet, which examines Dr. Verrall's account of the Recognition Scene in the *Choephoree*, but which had not the benefit of that lamented author's reply, it would appear that Verrall is in the right of it as against his critic—in this sense, that his interpretation can at least be got out of the text as it stands, whereas Mr. Hoernle's cannot. The dispute turns chiefly on these two verses:

πτέρραι τενόντων θ' ὑπογραφὰ μετρούμεναι
εἰς ταῦτό συμβαίνουσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς στίβοις.

To avoid the absurdity of supposing equality of size in a brother's and sister's feet as a means of recognition, Verrall (after Sir W. Ridgeway) took these lines to indicate an agreement in the proportion of parts, not in the size of the feet; and this again to be a mark of race, distinguishing Orestes and Electra as Pelopids of Asiatic origin from all other Argives. The measurements in question are those of the πτέρραι and τένοντες *inter se*, which are alike in both the brother and sister; and this seems perfectly possible Greek. Mr. Hoernle objects that nothing is said in the text about their being Pelopids of Asiatic origin; to which Verrall would probably have replied that it was in the story which Aeschylus presumed to be familiar to his audience. Mr. Hoernle's explanation is that Electra is already convinced of Orestes' *agency* in the matter of the hair, and that εἰς ταῦτό συμβαίνουσι can only mean 'come together to the same point as my tracks,' this observation enabling her to track Orestes to his hiding-place and discover his actual *presence*. This the words might signify elsewhere. But here their meaning is surely fixed by μετρούμεναι before them, or else that word itself has none, and accordingly Mr. Hoernle proceeds to emend it out of existence. Whether Verrall assumes more knowledge in the audience than can reasonably be allowed is open to question. But it is difficult to see how Aeschylus can be acquitted of absurdity except on some such hypothesis as his; and until a better one is offered perhaps we should accept it, unless we prefer to think that Aeschylus was careless.

AUSTIN SMYTH.

THE RHYTHM OF SPEECH.

The Rhythm of Speech. By Dr. W. THOMSON. One vol. 4to. Pp. 559+10. Glasgow: MacLehose and Jackson, 73, West George Street, 1923. £5 5s.

DR. THOMSON adduces, not as a view or opinion, but as a matter of universal observation and universal thought-expression, that a smith's blows on the anvil, themselves occupying no time, are in inorganic rhythm, meaning that they are uniform in strength and dealt at equal intervals (his 'quantities' in their most elementary form). On the same grounds the

rhythm of speech is also a matter of blows and intervals. But here the syllabic blows (called by him 'syllicts'), dealt one on the vowel of each syllable, are organic, varying in strength, and occurring at various simple intervals ('quantities') relatively determinable by easy tests. Dr. Thomson puts this proposition forward as a close-knit web of fact and the absolute negation of systems that profess to measure, not intervals, but syllables. These systems, he maintains, by ignoring the rhythmical points of force from and to which measurements are effected, put themselves wholly out of court: they make the settling of quantities not a matter of measuring at all, but an esoteric mystery, an arbitrary, imaginative act divorced from experimental verification. Could these propositions be disproved, Dr. Thomson declares that his book would become so much waste paper and his labour labour in vain.

The above summary, made by the author himself at my suggestion, indicates the general drift of this elaborate and interesting volume. I regret that I cannot myself accept Dr. Thomson's doctrine of 'blows', but space does not permit of any attempt to discuss it or its application to the verse of the ancient or modern languages, in detail. I must therefore content myself with referring readers of the *Class. Rev.* to the book itself, which should be studied respectfully, but critically, by all who are concerned with the basis on which the structure of verse, ancient and modern, rests. By 'experimental verification' Dr. Thomson means not the methods employed in phonetic laboratories, but a method of tapping with the finger which he uses as a means of measuring intervals of time.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

SOURCES FOR EGYPTIAN RELIGION.

Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae. Pars I. auctores ab Homero usque ad Diodorum continens. T. HOPFNER. One vol. Pp. 146. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1922.

THIS volume is one of the early numbers of a series purporting to give in a practical form the sources for the history of ancient religion to be found in the Greek and Latin authors. Should all the collaborators whom Karl Clemen has enlisted in his enterprise do their task as efficiently as Hopfner has in the work before us the series will be a most valuable addition to knowledge. The present volume is only an instalment of the portion dealing with Egyptian religion, and contains passages from authors arranged chronologically, beginning with Homer and ending with Diodorus. It is scarcely necessary to state that a large portion of the book is formed of excerpts from the last-named writer and from Herodotus. Side by side with these we find passages, naturally of varying value, culled from the most recondite sources, some of them doubtless new to many of us. The critical apparatus, without being unwieldy, provides all that is necessary to a judgment of the text from the point of view of its bearing on religion. The book is well printed, and the choice of type admirable throughout.

When the series is complete it will be interesting to compare the amount of real light thrown on the various religions—Persian, Egyptian, Babylonian, etc.—by the Greek and Roman writers. The historian of Egyptian religion finds the classical sources as a whole of disappointingly small value. They describe only the very latest phase, when the Pantheon was in complete confusion, and they practically confine themselves to repeating legends of the Egyptian gods and attempting identifications with their own. In other words, there is a lack of insight and critical spirit. They have given us some useful facts, but not one of them has attempted to touch the inner meaning—probably, it is fair to say, because there was very little to touch. The Egyptians, though they enjoyed in the eyes of the Greeks a great name for wisdom as the reputed inventors of medicine, mathematics, and astronomy, were in truth as little philosophical as a civilised nation can well be. This was true of their earlier days, and it is doubly true of the days of their decline. For abstract speculation, apart from possible and immediate concrete advantages to be drawn from it, they had no use. They may have deceived the Greeks at large, but they did not take in the acumen of Plato. τὸ φιλομαθές, he says, ὁ δὲ περὶ τὸν παρ' ἡμῶν μάλιστα ἂν τις αἰτιάσαστο τόπον, ἢ τὸ φιλοχρήματον τὸ περὶ τοὺς τε Φοίνικας εἶναι καὶ τοὺς κατὰ Αἴγυπτον φαίει τις ἂν οὐχ ἥκιστα.

Pars II. auctores ab Horatio usque ad Plutarchum continens. Pp. 125. 1923.

The second part of this work, which reached me after the above was in type, maintains the high standard of completeness and accuracy set by the first. Even Dioscurides is called upon for the minute details of mythical and religious lore afforded by his *materia medica*. A large portion of the volume is naturally occupied by Plutarch's *de Iside et Osiride*, which is quoted almost in its entirety.

The impression given by the volume as a whole is that the later classical authors are open to precisely the same criticism as the earlier, in that they show a great love for the legendary tittle-tattle of Egyptian religion, combined with a complete inability to probe its real meaning.

T. E. PEET.

CLASSICAL ATHEISM.

Atheism in Pagan Antiquity. By A. B. DRACHMANN. Pp. 5½" x 9". ix + 168. London: Gyldendal, 1922. 7s. 6d.

ENGLISH students may be grateful to Messrs. Gyldendal for their enlightened policy of making Scandinavian scholarship accessible. This little book is worth reading, and the translation is adequate. It surveys the history of ancient religious thought in order to determine how far atheism, in the sense of the denial of the reality of the gods, can be said to have existed, and in particular how far the philosophers, who were nicknamed *atheoi*, deserved the title. Inevitably the conclusions are mainly negative. The solution of the most radical questionings of the nature of God must always lie rather in the direction of ἔτερόν τι than of τὸ μὴ ὄν.

Prof
the no
religio
ciently
lies the
lated a
why bo
hated
custom
and the
state b
fealty.
called
philoso
with it
In the
charge
betwee
asebeia
not the
tions b
disord
rationa
Profess
survey
provid
individu
unpatr
Thoug
Socrat
in the
a joke.

The
pagan
enquir
in the
Critic
without
criticis
tent at
bows
gods
Judaic
demon
the tre
pagan
survive
l. 47.
by tra
pagan
has m
Mosle
the co
dumb
lost th
reason
charac
attribu
the w
perusa
simila
greate
consec
power

. 1 E
are th
is a S
Varth
p. 136

Professor Drachmann naturally emphasises the non-theological character of city state religion. Perhaps he hardly brings out sufficiently its social and civic character. In this lies the real reason why *asebeia* could be formulated as a criminal charge, and also the reason why both Jews and Christians earned popular hatred by their refusal to fit in with the ordinary customs and regulations of the rest of society, and the Christians the adverse attention of the state by their refusal to conform with acts of fealty. It is noticeable that what can fairly be called theological preoccupation first enters philosophy with the Cynics, when the city state with its limited horizon had really broken down. In the recorded prosecutions upon theological charges (Anaxagoras, Hermokopids, Diagoras between 416-414, Protagoras [?] 415, Socrates), *asebeia* is an instrument for creating prejudice, not the true motive of indictment. The prosecutions belong to a period of political strain and disordered nerves when superstition and a crude rationalism (*vide* the Melian Dialogue, which Professor Drachmann has omitted from his survey) were rampant. In less critical moments, provided that the theological theories of an individual did not involve him in anti-social or unpatriotic action, they were his own concern. Though subsequently used by the accusers of Socrates for more than it was worth, the attack in the *Clouds* at the time of its production was a joke.

The view taken by subsequent ages of the pagan gods opens up an interesting field of enquiry, the fringe of which is hardly touched in the brief concluding chapters of the book. Criticism of an alien religious system from without is, of course, a different matter from criticism from within. The dual but inconsistent attack—(1) 'The heathen in his blindness bows down to wood and stone'; (2) the alien gods are demons—which was inherited from Judaism, has persisted to our own day. The demonological view, of course, fell into line with the trend of the religious speculation of later paganism and a geocentric cosmography. It survived as late as Rawlinson on Herodotus I. 47. It was the habitual explanation offered by travellers of alien religions other than paganism, and Drachmann's allusion to Acosta has many parallels.¹ The whole mediaeval and Moslem view of archaeology would come into the completed story; the oracles which fell dumb at the Nativity and the talismans which lost their power at Mahomet's birth. The reason why later ages exaggerated the oracular character of ancient religion may perhaps be attributed to mediaeval theory. The history of the word 'negromancy,' or the most rapid perusal of the *Malleus Maleficarum*, or some similar treatise, will bring conviction that the greatest utility claimed for medieval magic, and consequently its greatest attraction, was the power of wresting the secrets of the future. In

the eighteenth century the emphasis shifted rather from oracles to mysteries conceived as a kind of Freemasonry, until Lobeck dealt the *coup de grâce* to the view that classical religion was something like the incoherent mysticism of *The Magic Flute*. W. R. HALLIDAY.

Chanties in Greek and Latin. Written for Ancient Traditional Airs. By W. H. D. ROUSE, Headmaster of the Perse School. Oxford. Blackwell. 2s. 6d.

It is a pity that Dr. Rouse should have set so many (nearly half) of his very entertaining 'Chanties' to French, German, or Italian tunes. The book is intended presumably for English schoolboys, and there are any number of English tunes which would have been better known and served his purpose as well. Also it was surely a mistake to employ a possibly older but certainly unfamiliar variant of 'John Brown's Body,' for 'What the Animals say,' and to give 'Malbrouk' instead of 'He's a jolly good Fellow.' The tunes themselves badly need phrase-marks to guide the scansion. Dr. Rouse has set himself a high standard of quantitative adjustment, but the expedient adopted in 'Torty-Tortoise' (♩ for ♩) is hardly a workmanlike one; and no expedient at all is offered for fitting the fifth line of 'Pyrgopolynices' to its notes. The Greek and the Latin is not always as idiomatic as it is rhythmical; see, for example, the third stanza of 'Salamis' for an odd use of μέγα φρονεῖν with the dative.

But it is churlish, and perhaps pedantic, to raise complaints against a book that combines so much amusement with instruction, and contains such really stirring ditties as 'The Siren,' 'Caesar's Triumph,' and above all 'Salamis' itself. J. BURNABY.

L'EPITOME NELLA LETTERATURA LATINA.

L'Epitome nella letteratura latina. By MARCO GALDI. 10' x 7". Pp. viii + 416. Napoli: P. Federico e G. Ardia, 1922. Lire 30.

It is almost inevitable that some should approach a history of epitomising with a certain amount of prejudice on the ground that the subject is a dry one and the phenomenon itself symptomatic of a decadent period, when creative literature had ceased and readers preferred summaries of famous books to the famous books themselves. Signor Galdi labours under no delusion in this respect. He does not conceal the truth that in ages of prolific literary production it would have been wasted industry to compose and issue abridgements, but he protests against classing epitomators universally as mediocrities (*chiamarli tutti 'homines inepti non mi par giusto*, p. 291). The third and fourth centuries of our era may be called the heyday of the epitomator, when minor writers and their thoughts appealed to readers more than did the great author. There was, in fact, definite hostility—from which emperors were not free—against older and fuller books; and if epitomators set to work they at least met a

¹ *E.g.* 'All the pictures around the said chapel are those of devils, and on each side of it there is a Sathanas seated in a seat,' Ludovico di Varthema, *Travels* (Hakluyt Society, 1868), p. 136.

demand, contributing to their own personal culture and aiding the reading public of the day, for whom probably half or even a smaller fraction of a literary loaf was better than no bread. The object of epitomators cannot be said to have been that of entirely supplanting the work from which they drew; they may have in some cases even awakened a desire to turn from the compendium to the detailed treatment in the original. Perhaps, then, it is futile to attempt to settle whether epitomes militated against the preservation of the work epitomised, for sometimes both original and epitome have come down together, as is true of Vitruvius and Faventinus. Two abridgements did not kill Valerius Maximus, nor did epitomators and excerptors cause Pliny's *Natural History* to disappear. Half of Seneca's *Controversies* and nearly three and a half decades of Livy survived in spite of being summarised, although, on the other hand, sometimes only the abridgement has descended to posterity. Justinus, for example, remains, while Trogus, his foundation, has perished.

The author has designed this careful work to fill a gap in the history of Latin literature by presenting a systematic examination of epitomes among the Romans and of their relationship to their originals. A natural impulse towards this general treatment of the subject came from the author's previous studies of Justinus, and from his desire to test how far the pervading characteristics of epitomators might be found conformable with Justinus' own guiding principle—*omittere quae nec cognoscendi voluptate iucunda nec exemplo essent necessaria*.

The treatise consists of an introduction, followed by twenty-eight chapters, a conclusion, five appendices, notes containing useful bibliographical matter, and an index. The introduction on composers of epitomes in Greece leads naturally to a chapter on the meaning of *ἐπιτομή* and its Latin equivalents, *compendium*, *summarium*, and, with certain qualifications, *breuiarium*. One chapter is given to the relationship of M. Junius Brutus to the annalists and to the literary life of his times; and several succeeding chapters treat fully the various epitomes of Livy, dealing with the theory that out of an older anonymous epitome a shorter one was made, and with the inferences derivable from the presence of non-Livian words or constructions. Regarding Florus, the author considers this epitomator to be the Florus with whom Hadrian exchanged jocular verses, and, like others since Wernsdorf, he ascribes to Florus the composition of the *Peruigilium Veneris*. Incidentally it may be noted that Mr. Fort in his recent edition of the poem called attention to the noticeably similar management of the endings of the trochaic tetrameter in the *Peruigilium* and in the fourth-century lines of Tiberianus. As a writer of condensed history, Florus did not slavishly or even exclusively use Livy; he was more of a Caesarian than Livy, and had his own pronounced view of the Empire as the outcome of a struggle between Fortune and Virtue—a view shared by Curtius Rufus concerning the career of Alexander.

About Licinianus, detected in 1857 in the majusculæ which formed the bottom stratum of writing in a *codex ter scriptus*, much remains obscure; but the author agrees with Camozzi that Licinianus was an epitomator rather than an annalist. The *Book of Prodigious* by Obsequens and the *Liber Memorialis* by Ampelius occupy the next two chapters, though, since Ampelius was admittedly anterior to Obsequens, it is not clear why he should have been treated after him. Strictly, the Livian *periocæ* are not epitomes, but they are succinctly considered in the chapter preceding the longest one in the book—namely, that handling Trogus and Justinus, the epitomator *par excellence*, and including questions of sources, style, and the extent to which the lost original is fairly represented in the abbreviation. Among the subjects of other chapters are Exuperantius in his relationship to Sallust, and abridgements of Valerius Maximus, Seneca's *Controversiae*, the elder Pliny, Verrius Flaccus, and Vitruvius. Aurelius Victor's *Historiae Abbreviatae* and the juridical epitomators are also treated. One of the late chapters, after emphasising the difference between 'epitome' and 'breuiarium,' passes on to discuss the historical *breuiaria* by Eutropius and Rufius Festus. Another indicates the difficulty in deciding whether certain compositions are to be deemed independent works or compendia—e.g., is the *Ilias Latina* (which some critics, on the strength of a forced acrostic, assign to Silius Italicus) to be considered an epitome, or simply a brief but free rehandling of the Homeric *Iliad*? The chapter on auto-epitomators expounds the motives prompting a writer to make a compendium of his own writings, and examines the instances of Varro, Lactantius, and others. Abbreviated translations and the last phases of epitome are the two concluding subjects; and the appendices open up themes which might well provide material for an additional volume—e.g., excerpts, centos, and Petrarch as auto-epitomator.

The work is characterised not only by scholarship, but by common-sense. The author's sanity and independence of judgment appear in his attitude on debated questions or fanciful hypotheses. The burning desire to discover and overstress similarities of expression between writers resembles to his mind that *pruritus emendandi* which leads to the replacing of manuscript readings by arbitrary and untenable conjectures, as, he says (p. 48), Merkel did in his text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The argument that the epitomator of Seneca the elder wrote solely for composers of *declamationes* is dismissed as an intemperate exaggeration of the sort indulged in by some critics 'beyond the Alps' (p. 58); while the dogmatic claim of Borchardt that definite passages in Justinus are obviously genuine portions of the lost Trogus is likened to the procedure of certain German philologists in connexion with the Homeric epics (p. 116). This individuality of outlook shows itself repeatedly after a statement and investigation of the theories of other scholars; thus, although the author often agrees with Schanz, he modifies that critic's notion that Pompeius Festus was an intellectually arrogant

person
tains t
arrogan
antiqu
Fronto
A few
'Wöflin
'Teuffe
'Avian
Statius
referre
p. 55.
Book
'carum
the ep
curious

TH
RE
Le Ide
By F
Pp.
siana
In this
duction
religiou
on the
of Italia
side th
mentio
volubile
Traian
are cit
suggest
and reg
critics.
cernible
to him
remark
resemb
While
attempt
thought
and inc
emphas
constan
the lost
ings, h
Domiti
simism
imperia
outline
from th
the his
his opin
ably m
Tacitus
work a
though
The
Stoic co
deep pe
extraor
gus ant
power
in his
Annals
Tacitus

person ('ein anmassender Mensch'), and maintains that Festus was independent rather than arrogant, and that he did not feel for Roman antiquity quite that reverence which marks Fronto or Aulus Gellius (p. 77).

A few slight misprints have been overlooked: 'Wöfflin' for 'Wölflin,' p. 36; 'Teuffell' for 'Teuffel,' p. 231; and the variation between 'Aviano' and 'Ariano' on p. 47. On p. 40 Statius' ode to Vibius Maximus should be referred to Book IV., not to V., of the *Silvae*; p. 55, the reference to Livy should be to Book I. 28, not I. 8; and in the quotation 'carum' is a mistake for 'earum.' On p. 289 the epitome of Vitruvius by Faventinus is curiously called 'la riduzione di Favorino.'

J. WIGHT DUFF.

THE POLITICAL, MORAL, AND RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF TACITUS.

Le Idee Politiche Morali e Religiose di Tacito.

By FRANCESCO ARNALDI. One vol. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 76. Roma: Scuola Tipografica Salesiana, 1921.

IN this essay, the author, after a brief introduction, has dealt with the political, moral, and religious ideas of Tacitus, basing his conclusions on the historian's text, and on the investigations of Italian, French, and German scholars. Outside those limits Lipsius alone seems to be mentioned ('Polandese molto erudito e molto volubile ch' entra trionfante nel Parnaso di Traiano Boccalini'), and no British authorities are cited. The study contains useful and suggestive matter regarding Tacitus' own views, and regarding views held about him by modern critics. Boissier's influence is plainly discernible, though the author is by no means tied to him; and among his most interesting remarks are those on Vico, and on certain resemblances between Tacitus and Dante. While the essayist is at pains to disclaim any attempt to frame a systematic picture of Tacitean thought, which exhibits notorious fluctuations and inconsistencies, he at the same time lays emphasis on prepossessions which are fairly constant in Tacitus, such as his admiration for the lost republican spirit, his aristocratic leanings, his belief in senatorial rule, his hatred of Domitian's tyranny, and his prevailing pessimism in spite of a resigned acceptance of imperialism. The political section includes an outline of his attitude to institutions and men from the youthful *Dialogus* onwards through the historical writings. Evidence concerning his opinions on previous historians is serviceably marshalled, and it is made clear that Tacitus' criticisms imply a claim for his own work as something different from theirs, and, though gloomier, more profound.

The next section indicates the influence of Stoic conceptions on Tacitus, and illustrates his deep penetration into character as well as his extraordinary skill in portrayal. In the *Dialogus* anticipatory signs are noted of that mature power of psychological analysis which is visible in his drawing of the three Caesars of the *Annals*. A questionable point is whether Tacitus was equally masterly in fathoming the

psychology of women or of the populace; here he may have found it still harder to emancipate himself from the effects of ancient prejudice and personal upbringing.

If no philosophy of religion can be established from the pages of Tacitus, there is yet in him a prevailing though confused sense of the divine; and the final section examines aspects thereof, and closes with a consideration of his failure to understand either Christianity or Judaism.

Defective proof-reading is an unfortunate blemish. Both Italian letterpress and Latin passages are at times imperfectly or misleadingly punctuated; and there are misprints like *convellentum*, p. 27, l. 3; *prodiones* for *proditionis*, p. 27, l. 14; and the impossible *maioro*, p. 46, l. 1. Many references are inaccurate as to book or chapter—e.g., p. 13, n. 5, *Ann.* 3, 38 should be 2, 38; p. 63, n. 2, Nero's matricide is referred to *Ann.* Book 4 instead of Book 14; p. 22, n. 5, *Ann.* 14, 39 should be 14, 19, where also the reference to Quintilian, *Inst.* 10, 104 should be 10, 1, 102. On p. 54, 'in quel capitolo 28 del libro II degli *Annali*,' both book and chapter are wrong, for the reference is intended for 6, 22, the chapter contrasting the fate-theory with the chance-theory of life; and the same chapter seems to be meant by the false reference, *Ann.* 2, 22, on p. 56, n. 4. On p. 6, n. 9, '*Ann.* 10, 21' refers to a non-existent book; p. 43, n. 5 '*Carmina* 33' is an incomplete reference to Horace; and p. 56, n. 14, '*Ann.* 165' is meaningless. In the Italian text, p. 20, 'Licinio Marco' looks misleading for Licinius Macer, and on p. 64 and p. 65 'Trasca' should be 'Trasea.' P. 13, n. 7, '11, 21 su Cluvio Rufo' betrays confusion between two entirely different historians, Curtius Rufus and Cluvius.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

The Arts in Greece. By F. A. WRIGHT. One vol. 8vo. Pp. viii+111. London: Longmans, 1923. 6s.

THIS little work consists of three essays, respectively on the dance, music, and painting in Hellas. The arts which Mr. Wright selects are obviously those about which we know the least; as to Greek poetry, the drama, and sculpture we are far better informed, and we have to apply to the arts of which Mr. Wright speaks the principles thence derived. The author is a convinced admirer of Greek culture, and of its character he has a very good notion, though he sometimes exaggerates. Some of his dicta are very bold, as when he says that the proficiency of Germans in instrumental music is a result of the harshness of the German language, and that the Greeks would have fully approved the pianola, but condemned the violin. But on the whole, this book is to be highly commended; it is based on learning and reflexion, and it is very suggestive. The greatest doubt of the reviewer is whether, outside a very narrow circle, readers will be able to follow it without more explanation and illustration. The author mentions Greek vases in the Louvre, the Hermitage, and other museums, as if they were

familiar to readers, and does not describe them. Evidently he can visualise them himself; but even classical scholars would wish for an engraving, or at least a reference to some work in which they are published. The few who have adequate knowledge will gladly read and digest the book. Could it not, or at least the section on painting, be brought out in a fuller form?

P. GARDNER.

Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, Vol. I.: De Glossariis Latinorum Origine et Fatis, scripsit GEORGIUS GOETZ. Leipzig (Teubner), 1923; pp. vii+431; 22 sh.

AT last the veteran professor of Jena University has finished his *monumentum aere perennius*, begun in 1888. Congratulations to him and homage. In this crowning volume the information scattered through the prefaces of Vols. II.-V. and his article 'Glossographie' in *Pauly-Wissowa* is collected in revised form. But since the new material is mainly found in a supplement by Professor Wessner (pp. 309-91), entitled *De Lindsayi eiusque Discipulorum Studiis Glossographicis*, I have asked Dr. Mountford to relieve me of the task of reviewing it.

W. M. LINDSAY.

In his *Addenda* Professor Wessner summarises and discusses British articles and pamphlets published before June 1922, and appends a short study of his own on the Glossae Iuvenalianae. Professed students of glossaries will find his criticisms and halting commendations interesting and of some value; but it may be doubted whether his work can be safely used by anyone not familiar with the ground traversed. All his inaccuracies and hasty judgments cannot be adequately indicated here, though a selection will warn readers not to trust too implicitly to this new volume.

More bold than Goetz, Wessner (p. 313) thinks that the inscription found in an eleventh-century MS. at Madrid (and supposed to indicate the place and date of the compilation of *Abstrusa-Abolita*) is copied 'sine dubio' from a seventh-century MS. But the glossary follows a law-code (the *Lex Visigothorum*) ending with the word *filios gloriosos Bambam et Vitizam reges* in painted majuscules. Attracted by the large coloured letters the scribe tried his pen hurriedly on this sentence before beginning to transcribe the glossary. So the 'mira inscriptio' is a mere 'probatio pennae,' a fact which Wessner could have discovered by examining the facsimile of Muñoz and the work of Hartel (which Goetz mentions)!

The treatment accorded to Professor Lindsay's Festus studies is unworthy of Wessner's powers. He has in the first place neglected one of the most important foundations of Lindsay's structure — the presence of groups of possible Festus items in *Abolita*. In addition to thus falsifying Lindsay's position he is unwilling to recognise that a glossary compiler, within limits, may remodel his material, and he takes no account of alterations in transmission. Comparing *Murrina potio divina, quae apud Graecos dicitur nectar, id est vinum murratum*

with the epitome of Paulus (*M. genus potionis, quae Graece dicitur vixrap, hanc mulieres vocabant muriolam, quidam murratum vinum*) he gravely doubts Festus as the source of the glossary item. Yet (p. 375) Wessner is ready to believe that a *Liber Glossarum* item (*Remex dictus*, etc.) comes from Isid. *Etym.* 19, 1, 6 in spite of the fact that the item is labelled *De Glossis*, and its last sentence is not in Isidore at all. Scepticism may be salutary, but it should not be capricious.

Again, 'comprobatur autem vetustiorum librum in universum cum Palatino consentire recentiorum in Italia exaratum' (p. 332) is not a sufficiently accurate report of statements that 'the alphabetical arrangement (of the older Tours MS. of Lib. Gloss.) agrees for the most part with that of *Vat. Pal.*,' and that the younger MS. is written in a 'fifteenth-century Italian hand.' In point of fact the older MS. does not belong to the *Vat. Pal.* family, nor was the younger MS. written in the Italian peninsula.

In his discussion of the Glossae Vergilianae, Wessner plies an oar of his own. Relying unwisely on Goetz's excerpts (not one-tenth of the total) from Lib. Gloss., he rashly argues that a Paris glossary (lat. nouv. acq. 1298) represents the nucleus of Lib. Gloss. (p. 332, 374). He does not know that one item in ten of the Paris glossary is not found in Lib. Gloss. and that these omitted items are of various types (*Abstrusa*, *Abolita*, *Placidus*, *Quotation-items*, etc.). His analysis of the Paris glossary is itself insufficient; there are thirty-four Isidore items of which he has found only twenty, and all of them (not two or three) are in Lib. Gloss. The presence of Eucherius items has entirely escaped him.

All through these pages Professor Wessner clings to the heresy that each glossary compiler had independent access to ancient texts and lore, and he unnecessarily multiplies the sources on which he supposes the compilers drew. This mistaken view explains his treatment of Festus glosses, but it scarcely justifies his cavalier disparagement of Dr. H. J. Thomson's demonstration that much ancient lore in glossaries came from Vergil scholia (by way of a fuller form of the *Abstrusa* glossary). In some details Wessner's dissent is weighty and worth consideration; but his pages on the whole cannot be said to possess the accuracy and authority one expects to find in the introductory volume of an important Corpus.

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

The Ecclesiazusae of Aristophanes. Translated into corresponding metres by B. B. ROGERS. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1923. Paper, 2s. net; cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

THIS reprint, which outwardly resembles Murray's versions of Euripides, gives the English without the Greek, a page of introduction, stage directions drawn from Rogers's text or commentary, and four pages of notes. Six plays are announced as ready, and others are to follow. Good.

E. HARRISON.

GREEK INDUSTRIES.

'Fabrieken' en 'Fabrikanten' in Griekenland. Door Professor Dr. H. BOLKESTEIN. Pp. 32. (Overdruk uit *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, afl. 1, 1923. Groningen: P. Noordhoff. In the inventory of Demosthenes' heritage why is nothing allowed for factory, machinery, tools? Dr. Bolkestein explains; and round

his interpretation of the passage of Demosthenes he has written a most instructive exposure of the mistakes of the German historians who describe Greek industries in terms drawn from the economics of to-day. Failing German and English translations of the pamphlet, let us hope at least for an ample notice in the *J.H.S.*

E. HARRISON.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

MUSÉE BELGE, XXVII. 4-9.

(APRIL-JULY, 1923.)

A. Delatte, *Le Déclin de la Légende des Sept Sages et les Prophètes théosophiques*. R. Cagnat, *La Colonie romaine de Djemila (Algérie)*. Ancient Cuicul (plans and photographs). P. Faider, Sen. *De Ira* l. 1. 4, 'magnasque irae minas agens,' probably quoted from Ovid's *Medea*. P. Graindor, *Études sur Athènes sous Auguste*. I.G. III. 594 (cp. 574, 584, 599, honours to Romans not later than Aug.). Boule honours Livy with statue in lifetime. Livy no doubt visited Athens. M. Clerc, *Marseille et Jules César*. Caesar deliberately misrepresents motives of M. in resisting him; Dio and Lucan (after Livy) nearer truth. E. Cavaignac, *Témoignages de Non-philosophes sur Socrate*. S. once an ordinary sophist, and not too blindly caricatured in Ar. *Clouds*, when Plato and Xen. children. Condemned (against amnesty) partly because superior attitude to parties resented. A. Blanchet, *Note sur la Legio V. Mac. sous Gallien et Victorin*. A. Piganiol, *Obs. sur la Date des Traités conclus entre Rome et Carthage*. Polybius' first and second texts should be transposed; 509 an error, because a Junius Brutus figured in treaty of 328. Four treaties: 348, 328, 306, 279. R. Scalais, *Une Étude sur la Législation financière de la Sicile*. With reference to J. Carcopino: *La Lot d'Héron et les Romains* (Paris, 1919). L.-A. Constans, *Les Débuts de la Lutte entre César et Vercingetorix*.

MUSÉE BELGE: BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PÉDAGOGIQUE.

(XXVII. 4-8.)

GREEK.—Heraclitus: V. Macchiario, *Eraclito. Nuovi Studi sull' Orfismo* (Bari, 1922). Adventurous and unsound (Delatte). Lucian: J. Humbert et A. Masson, *Dialogues choisis* (4^e éd. Gand). Favourable (Willem). LATIN.—Cicero: J. Martha, *Pro Milone* (4^e éd. Colin). E. Courbaud, *De l'Orateur I. Texte établi et traduit* (Paris, Soc. d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1922, 12 fr.). Favourable (Hinnisdals). Tacitus: H. Goelzer, H. Bornecque, G. Rabaud, *Dial. Agr. Germ. Texte établi et traduit* (1922, same publ. 16 fr.). Literary problems well discussed and text 'adroitly conservative' (Hinnisdals).

NO. CCXCI. VOL. XXXVII.

GENERAL.—W. E. Heitland, *Agricola*. Excellent instrument de travail (Scalais). L. Homo, *Problèmes sociaux de jadis et d'à présent* (Flammarion, 1922). Ancient housing, cost of living, taxation, depopulation (Scalais). G. Bloch, *L'Empire romain* (Flammarion, 1922, 7 fr. 50). Survey based on wide knowledge of sources (Scalais). V. Schollaert, *Hist. de la Grèce ancienne* (Coll. Belge, Manuels d'Histoire) (Tournai, 1921). Favourable (Scalais). L. Heuzey, *Hist. du Costume antique* (Champion, 1922, 60 fr.). His crowning work (Ed.). Sandys, *Companion to Latin Studies* (3rd ed.). The fullest and best existing manual: inadequate on Christian literature and on metre (Jamet). Obituary notice of E. Merchie.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR DAS KLAS-SISCHE ALTERTUM, ETC. (ILBERG).

(LI./LII. 1, 2, 3, 1923.)

1. Conrad Cichorius, *Römische Studien: Historisches, Epigraphisches, Literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms* [Leipzig u. Berlin, Teubner, 1922] (F. Münzer). Praised most warmly as a storehouse of new and valuable results: but criticised on several points of detail.—Karl Joël, *Geschichte der Antiken Philosophie. Erster Band* [Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1921] (W. Nestle). Enthusiastically praised.—Otto Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien erklärt* [Leipzig u. Berlin, Teubner, 1922] (E. Bethe). Highly praised: the extreme compression of the notes is lamented. Bethe challenges Schroeder's belief in Pindar's noble birth.
2. Adolf Schulten, *Avienus Ora Maritima (Periplus Massiliensis saec. VI. a. C.) adiunctis ceteris testimoniis anno 500 a. C. antiquioribus (=Fontes Hispaniae Antiquae, fasc. I.)* [Barcelona, A. Bosch, Berlin, Weidmann, 1922]. The same, *Tartessos. Ein Beitrag zur ältesten Geschichte des Westens* [Hamburg, L. Friederichsen and Co., 1922] (H. Renkel). Both works are warmly praised, especially the analysis of Avienus' sources (going back to a Massilian work of c. 530 B.C.). The immense importance of Tartessos from the second millennium B.C. is emphasised.
3. Armin von Gerkan, *Das Theater von Priene als Einzelanlage und in seiner Bedeutung für das hellenistische Bühnengewesen* [München-Berlin-Leipzig, Verlag für praktische Kunstwissenschaft F. Schmidt, Komm.-Ges., 1921]

N

(A. Rumpf). A masterpiece of careful investigation. Rumpf considers that von Gerkan has proved that at Priene the *proskenion* was originally (from end of fourth till second century B.C.) a *background*, later a *stage*: but the function of its flat wooden covering remains mysterious.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(MAY-AUGUST, 1923.)

GREEK LITERATURE. — N. Wecklein, *Über Zusätze und Auslassungen von Versen im Homerischen Texte* [SB. d. K. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. München, 1918, Franz. Pp. 84] (Drerup). W., following Zenodotus, rejects freely what he believes to be spurious lines and passages. Reviewer not convinced. — *Orphicorum fragmenta*. Collegit O. Kern [Berlin, 1922, Weidmann. Pp. x + 407] (Körte). Almost oppressively full collection of authorities, followed by very exact text of the fragments with detailed references to the literature on each. — E. Howald, *Die Briefe Platons* [Zürich, 1923, Seldwyla. Pp. 197] (Nestle). Very careful edition, with introduction, critical apparatus, and commentary; a distinct advance in the research on Plato's letters. — F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten, II., Zweite Hälfte* [Berlin, 1922, de Gruyter. Pp. 143] (Kiessling). Completes the various indices to the 6,000 documents contained in Vol. I. of this valuable work.

LATIN LITERATURE. — *Die Komödien des Plautus*. Übersetzt von L. Gurlitt [Berlin, 1920-21, Propyläenverlag, Vols. 16-19. Pp. xi + 497; xi + 462; xiv + 587; xiv + 510] (Funck). G.'s translation, with separate introduction to each play, embodies the rich results of his Plautine research. Reviewer censures G. for detecting unnecessary obscenities. — E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* [Berlin, 1922, Weidmann. Pp. 435] (Klotz). F.'s collection and discussion of the characteristics of Plautus as distinct from those of his Greek models allow us a deeper insight into the nature of P.'s art. Favourable review. — *P. Ovidii Nasonis Remedia amoris*. Adnotationibus exegeticis instruxit G. Némethy [Budapest, 1921, Acad. Litt. Hung. Pp. 70] (Magnus). The interpretation is confined to notes on single passages; often thin and far from thorough, but marks some advance on previous editions. Reviewer discusses N.'s text in some detail. — *Supplementum Commentariorum ad Ovidii Amores, Tristia, et Epistulas ex Ponto*. Scripsit G. Némethy [Budapest, 1922, Acad. Litt. Hung. Pp. 47] (Magnus). Criticism and interpretation of numerous passages. — *Iulii Frontini de aquaeductu urbis Romae commentarius*. Edidit F. Krohn [Leipzig, 1922, Teubner. Pp. vii + 58] (Hosius). Very careful edition; text conservative, apparatus too brief.

PHILOSOPHY. — A. Goedeckemeyer, *Aristoteles praktische Philosophie (Ethik und Politik)* [Leipzig, 1922, Dieterich. Pp. 254] (Wallies). Second only to Zeller's work, which it resembles in its calm objectivity, and which it frequently supplements. — † O. Willmann, *Pythagoreische Erziehungsweisheit. Aus dem literar. Nachlass hrsg. von Wenzel Pohl* [Freiburg, 1922, Herder. Pp. viii + 110] (Seeliger). Will be welcomed by all who believe in a religious basis for education. — L. Leisegang, *Griechische Philosophie von Thales bis Platon und Hellenistische Philosophie von Aristoteles bis Plotin* [Breslau, 1922 and 1923, Hirt. Pp. 128 and 132] (Seeliger). A happy summary, intended for wide circles and written in clear and dignified language.

LANGUAGE. — J. Huber, *De lingua antiquissimorum Graeciae incolarum. Commentationes Aenipontanae quas edunt E. Diehl et E. Kalinka, IX.* [Vienna, 1921, Fromme] (Jax). H. tries to sift out the pre-Greek elements in Greek; these he finds especially in names of plants and animals, geographical names, etc. Warmly welcomed by reviewer as filling a large gap in our knowledge.

ARCHAEOLOGY. — E. Krüger, *Der Aufbau des Mausoleums von Halikarnass* [SA. aus Bonner Jahrb., 127. Bonn, 1922. Pp. 22; 3 plates] (P. Herrmann). Noteworthy new restoration, based on fresh measurements of pyramid steps. — A. Minto, *Populonia, la necropoli arcaica* [Florence, 1922, Bemporad. Pp. 171; 13 plates and 27 illustrations] (Lamer). Account of Villanova and later graves at P., and of their contents; a scholarly working up of reports in Not. d. Scavi since 1908. — F. Poulsen, *Vases grecs récemment acquis par la Glyptothèque de Ny-Carlsberg* [Copenhagen, 1922, Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Pp. 27; 11 plates] (Lamer). Reliable, well-illustrated account of twenty-four representative pieces in the new Greek Vase Department at Ny-Carlsberg. — G. Lippold, *Gemmen und Kameen des Altertums und der Neuzeit* [Stuttgart, N.D., Hoffmann; 1,695 illustrations on 167 plates] (W. Müller). Nearly two-thirds of the material is classical; intended for art lovers. Reviewer censures arrangement by subjects and enlargement of gems on the plates. — M. Schede, *Die Burg von Athen* [Berlin, 1922, Schoetz u. Parhysius; 28 illustrations in the text, 99 on plates, and 1 coloured plate] (Ippel). Aims at giving pictures of Acropolis and its monuments in successive periods, with historical introduction to each. Treatment of poroscultures specially praised. Recommended for schools.

PALAEOGRAPHY. — R. P. Robinson, *De fragmenti Suetoniani de grammaticis et rhetoribus codicum nexu et fide* [University of Illinois Press, 1922. Pp. 195] (Wessner). Thorough and fruitful preparation for the edition which R. promises. Reviewer gives a full summary.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

Professor Conway is to be congratulated upon undertaking, in *The Making of Latin*, a task that is too frequently neglected by his confrères, who studiously hold themselves aloof from modern linguistic work. A distinguished professor of Greek once told the writer that he cared not a jot how Greek was pronounced, and it mattered nothing to him that his pupils were ignorant of its alleged pronunciation. Then, turning from the language of the dead to that of the living, 'Why,' he asked, 'should we expect our honours students of French to pronounce French well, so long as they know something about their French literature?'

Literature is safe in the hands of such zealous champions, but in the meantime language perishes. Speech does not normally exist apart from pronunciation, and in the main, casting aside for a moment syntax and semantics, the history of language is an affair of the much despised pronunciation.

Professor Conway does not share this restricted outlook, and he has made a serious attempt to describe the phonetic structure and the origin of Latin. It is a contribution that students of Romance philology especially will be grateful for, and it is in the hope that certain errors will be removed in future editions that the following remarks are made.

The study of phonetics, to which some attention is devoted in this country, has made it clear that in dealing with speech-sounds, it is essential that some attempt at scientific method should be adopted in classification. A more accurate classification of speech-sounds, both vowel and consonant, would have been of great help in this book. Moreover, to talk of vowels, consonants, and sonants is to lead the student to imagine that 'sonants' are a class of sounds that are neither vowel nor consonant. The definition of vowels as 'sounds produced by the voice passing through the mouth while the tongue and lips are held in some particular position' is inaccurate. According to this definition *l* is a vowel, and the diphthong *ou* is not. Vowels are voiced sounds in which there is neither complete obstruction nor any narrowing of the speech organs such as to cause audible friction.

The definition of a consonant as a sound that cannot be heard unless it is accompanied by a sonant is inaccurate. The sounds usually represented by the letters *s*, *z*, *v*, *f* are all consonants, and they can, of course, be heard without any accompanying sonant.

It should be made clear that these 'sonants', *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, are in reality syllabic consonants; their sonority is so little inferior to that of vowels that they are able to form syllables without the help of vowels.

The semi-vowels are not well explained. The English words 'way' and 'low' do not end in semi-vowel sounds. Is Professor Conway guilty of confusing sound and symbol?

The *l* sound is produced when the air-passage is stopped in the middle by the tip of the tongue, and the voice emerges at one side or at both sides. To say that when *l* is produced the sides of the tongue are vibrated is not in accordance with fact.

The palatal plosive is not heard in the English words 'kin' and 'get,' but a slightly fronted velar plosive. The initial sound of 'shut' is not a palatal fricative, but an alveolar fricative.

In the production of nasal consonants, *all* the air, not part of it, passes through the nose. It is in the production of nasalised vowels that a part only of the air escapes through the nose. The palatal nasal consonant does not occur in English.

To say that 'in vulgar Southern English *w* is pronounced as *w*,' is to accuse of vulgarity many who will be quite justified in resenting the aspersion. Professor Wyld's view of the matter is different.

The question of Professor Conway's symbols is too wide to be discussed here. Modern phonetic teaching, acting upon psychological grounds, discourages the use of diacritics. Why use *u* for a sound that is so generally represented by *w*?

Most university students, coming from schools where modern languages are taught on modern lines, are acquainted with a phonetic alphabet that is used effectively for the transcription of speech sounds in scores of books. If Professor Conway had made use of this alphabet, and given transcriptions of Latin prose and verse, marking length and stress, he would have added very considerably to the value of his work. Also he would not have had to repeat the list of Latin vowels from the 'table issued by the authority of the Classical Association.' This list would be criticised by any Fifth Form boy who had been taught French by a competent teacher; *ɛ* is described as being 'as *e* in prey, or French *é* as in *blé*.' The English and French sounds have nothing in common.

i is described as being as 'feed or French *amie*.' Why is *amie* feminine? All final vowels in Parisian French are short, whether masculine or feminine. It is only in certain dialects that distinctions of length are made between masculine and feminine words.

The foundation of any linguistic work must be the student's native tongue. Until he knows the structural details of the tongue he uses daily, he is not likely to talk with intelligence about the languages long since dead. It is in the provision of this essential preliminary information that Professor Conway's book falls short, and if in future editions he would rewrite the earlier chapters in the light of modern phonetic teaching, he would add much to our gratitude.

A. LLOYD JAMES.

Department of Phonetics,
University College, London.

A REJOINDER TO MR. LLOYD-JAMES
ON THE MAKING OF LATIN.

LET me thank¹ Mr. Lloyd-James for pointing out one serious mistake in the definition of a consonant which I noted for correction directly the book appeared. But otherwise the differences between us seem to me almost wholly a matter of wording. Save on a trivial point he quotes no authorities for his statements, and it would therefore be enough here to say, what is true, that in no one of the points which he raises is his wording commended by the results of my own study. Since, however, such *ripistes* take nobody any further, I add below my reasons, more briefly than I could wish for courtesy's sake, but humbly obeying the Editors.

The source of Mr. James' complaint lies in the difference between what I set out to do and what he would have liked. Besides complaining generally of the limits of the Phonetic sections he asks that I should transcribe passages of Latin into a modern 'Phonetic Alphabet.' He holds that students should not be allowed to approach the history of Latin without first having mastered the phonetics of English and one of the competing systems of phonetic notation. Viator enumerates twenty-two different schemes for classifying the vowels alone which have been put forward by twenty different authors between 1803 and 1908.

No one could hold more strongly than I do that students of language should know that they are talking about sounds, not written symbols, and should have some idea how those sounds were produced; but to say that no knowledge of the history of Latin is possible without the same kind of phonetic precision which is desirable in the study of a modern language, is a view which would be rejected by all the great scholars whose work in the last half-century has built up the fabric of philological knowledge. The *Transcriptionsmiserè* also should be kept in its proper place, not thrust upon beginners.

Hence Mr. Lloyd-James everywhere quarrels with my phonetic descriptions, as being incomplete. I dismiss the vowels in twelve lines, adding: 'This is, of course, only a very rough description. In nearly all languages there are a great many intermediate positions giving rise to special kinds of vowels.'

Viator (*Elemente der Phonetik des Deutschen Eng. u. Französ.*, Ed. 6, 1915) gives them 163 octavo pages, mostly of small print. The question whether I have succeeded in selecting the most certain points involves no general principle. One matter, however, concerns the Classical Association, and is typical of Mr. Lloyd-James' attitude. He falls foul of the

scheme of Latin Pronunciation issued by that Association (after the report of a specialist Committee) and adopted by the Board of Education, and wishes it replaced by more precise phonetic descriptions.

This scheme has been a document of importance in all English schools; it had a practical not merely a scientific purpose; and none of its statements are erroneous, except from the point of view of minute phonetic precision. The gulf which there is between Mr. James' attitude and that of the Association is well shown by his remark on the sound of *e* in Latin. This the scheme describes as being like English *ey* in *prey*, or French *é* as in *blé*. Mr. Lloyd-James observes that 'the English and French sounds have nothing in common.'

The descriptions given of the Latin sound were meant as approximations, not identical; but they indicate what we know of the Latin sound closely enough for practical purposes. But what of Mr. Lloyd-James' own statement? Is that quite a model of precision? Does he mean to deny that both the English and French sounds are formed with unimpeded voice? To deny that both are formed with the lips unrounded? To deny that the positions taken by the tongue in both are intermediate between the positions taken in forming the *a* of English *father* and the *i* of English *machine* respectively, but different from both these? All this, in Mr. Lloyd-James' view, is 'nothing.' A more reasonable estimate would be that these three statements cover nine-tenths of the relevant facts. As to the remaining tenth, I shall be happy to learn more from any phonetician who can teach me, whenever I engage in the study of French sounds for their own sake.

I add a few notes on matters of detail:

(1) On some points Mr. James seems to have missed what the book does contain. All that he says about sonants will be found explicitly stated in §§ 30 and 34.

(2) Mr. James rejects my definition of a vowel as 'a sound produced by the voice passing through the mouth while the tongue and lips are held in some particular position'; and he adds: 'according to this definition *l* is a vowel and the diphthong *ou* is not.' Certainly it is not. The definition of a vowel must distinguish it from a diphthong. Nor does my definition include *l* as I described it (formed by some 'vibration' of the sides of the tongue); that, however, would be the effect of Mr. Lloyd-James' two definitions. In the description he gives above of *l*, where is there anything about 'audible friction,' the absence of which he regards as marking a vowel? According to Mr. James sonant *l* is simply a vowel.

(3) As to consonant *l*, Mr. Lloyd-James' definition is in conflict with Viator's (p. 253), who calls *l* a kind of fricative in which a 'very loose narrowing' is enough; adding that stronger narrowing and clear friction appear when it is voiceless.

I depart from Viator by substituting for 'a fricative with a very loose narrowing' the phrase 'formed by vibration of the tongue' in order to describe what I seem to hear in many languages—for instance, in Welsh, Italian,

¹ The Editors rightly deprecate any comments from me on Mr. Campbell's generous review of the book; but they allow me to say that I believe the misprints, with two errors which he pointed out, are now all corrected in a list of *Errata*, and that this will be sent post free to any previous purchaser of the book who applies to the publisher.

and so
descrip
differen
real fri
soun
venient
adopt
(4) I
words
sounds
into the
examp
repres
sented
diphth
pp. 94
Englis
persen
Lehrbu
tions).
(5) T
phonet
'palata
nor do
tion wo
c and g
(6) 'f
fricativ
no need
though
descrip
these fr
rubbed
the pal
lish *sh*
certain
even if
formed
(7) 'the air,
If Mr.
sonants
m and
every c
followe
some of
m differ
voice is
through
remove
(p. 301)
nasal re
(8) 'occur in
called t
be calle
nasal.'
(9) M
'Phone
certain
I shall
not free
so-calle
Viator's
open to
of the l
Brugma
No dou
sounds
phonetic

and sometimes in English. No doubt Vietor's description is safer. Nevertheless there is a difference of kind between the rough hissing of real fricatives like *f* and *s* and the more musical sound of the liquids; 'vibration' seems a convenient term to represent this; but I will gladly adopt a better when anyone can suggest it.

(4) Mr. Lloyd-James says that the English words *way* and *low* 'do not end in semi-vowel sounds,' and gently suggests that I was deluded into that belief by their spelling. I chose these examples, because the spelling, for once, fairly represents the sound. These sounds are represented by Sweet (*Handbook*, p. 110) by the diphthongs *ei* and *ou*, also by Vietor (*Elem.*, pp. 94 and 109). Jespersen and True, in *Spoken English*, represent them by *e'* and *o'* (see Jespersen's discussion on pp. 144 and 153 of his *Lehrbuch der Phonetik* for more precise descriptions).

(5) There is no room in twelve pages of phonetic explanations to distinguish between a 'palatal plosive' and a 'slightly fronted velar'; nor do I know how to ascertain which description would best suit the ancient Latin sound of *c* and *g*.

(6) 'The initial sound of *shut* is not a palatal fricative, but an alveolar fricative.' There was no need to discuss the alveolar sounds as such, though I noticed the term as a more exact description of the English 'dentals.' About these fricatives I wrote that the current of air is rubbed 'between the tongue and some part of the palate; the commonest kind is that of English *sh* in *shut*.' I must submit that *sh* is certainly palatal in my own pronunciation; but even if it is alveolar in other speakers, it is formed 'at some part of the palate.'

(7) 'In the production of nasal consonants all the air, not part of it, passes through the nose.' If Mr. Lloyd-James uses the term nasal consonants, as I do, to include the full sounds of *m* and *n*, I have nothing to say but that in every case (save where they are immediately followed and so curtailed by a breathed plosive) some of the voice escapes through the mouth—*m* differs from *b* only in this, that while the voice is blocked by the lips some of it escapes through the nose; as soon as the block is removed, it escapes at the lips also. Vietor (p. 301) describes them as 'Explosives with nasal resonance.'

(8) 'The palatal nasal consonant does not occur in English.' I suppose that what I have called the palatal nasal in words like *king* would be called by Mr. James 'a slightly fronted velar nasal.'

(9) Mr. James is careful not to name the 'Phonetic Alphabet' which (he says) is used in certain schools. If it comes under my notice, I shall observe with interest whether it is or is not free from the appalling obscurities of Sweet's so-called Romic; nor can I find anywhere in Vietor's books a system of notation that is not open to grave objections. The slight extensions of the Latin alphabet devised by Sievers and Brugmann nowhere suggest a false meaning. No doubt they are inadequate for denoting the sounds of modern languages as precisely as phoneticians desire. It does not follow that

they are not good as far as they go; still less that they are not in place for the general description which is all that we can provide for languages no longer spoken. R. S. CONWAY.

'WORD-ORDER IN HORACE.'

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,

I have to thank Mr. Cookson for writing at such length on my 'Word-Order in Horace.' He has, obviously, struggled to be just in the face of 'the almost personal resentment which one feels in being confronted with a wholly new view on so familiar a book as the *Odes*.' I fear, too, that he has sometimes tempered the wind. But in fairness to the theory, for what it is worth, may I be allowed to defend myself against one or two criticisms? Mr. Cookson chooses the first six lines of the first Ode of Book I. to justify the verdict that my 'conclusions . . . are, to say the least of it, apt to do some violence to the natural meaning of a passage.'

I will take the criticisms in their order. On l. 1 I have called *regibus* emphatic, and have remarked that *regibus edite* would 'scan equally well.' Mr. Cookson denies the truth of this remark. But if Horace could end the last line of this Ode with *uertice*, why should he not end the first line with *edite*? In *Odes* l. 3, Horace concludes nine out of twenty Asclepiads with short open vowels, and nearly all these lines 'end a colon' (if I understand this phrase aright).

On l. 2, Mr. Cookson asks 'why not *dulce meum decus*?' I have answered that it was usual in Latin prose and poetry (as in Italian and French) to put the adjectives on either side of the noun. What more can I say? The order is conventional like 'bread and butter,' 'almonds and raisins.' As to the *nostros* of *Odes* III. 6, 10, Bentley's exact objection is not quite clear; Wickham thinks that he 'objected to the series of accusatives as prosaic.' In any case, the loneliness of *nostros, nostris, nostrorum* requires comment.

Next, speaking of *puluerem Olympicum* (l. 3), Mr. Cookson holds that on my principles *Olympicum* would be unemphatic. But what I have said in the first section of the *Prolegomena* is that 'when Horace departs from the normal order . . . he wishes to draw our attention to the abnormality and so to emphasise for us the point which he desires to make.' I have not said that a word in a normal position cannot be of interest; on the contrary, the essential meaning of a word may be such that it requires no change of position; and this seems to be true of *Olympicum* and of *nobilis* (l. 5).

The criticism about *feruidis* (l. 4) is perfectly just. One can only answer that certain orders became crystallised. Thus in the familiar hyperbaton *maximis efferrat laudibus* (Cic. *De Amic.* 7, 24) it is, perhaps, impossible to tell whether any extra force is given to the adjective; the hyperbaton had become so conventional. The extension of this hyperbaton to participles, as in *uariis obsita floribus* (*Odes* l.

18, 12), is natural enough; and this example is exactly similar to *feruidis euitata rotis*, as I have pointed out in the *Prolegomena* (p. xvi, top line; 'but most of the examples might be classed under § 24').

I have now touched upon all that Mr. Cookson says about these six lines, and, *nisi me amor mei negotii fallit*, I still feel that my conclusions are not, 'to say the least of it, apt to do some violence to the natural meaning of a passage.'

One last word: Mr. Cookson quotes the frequent type *superiecto pauidae natarunt aequore dammae*. This is another conventional hyperbaton, and really a compound form of the type *maximis efferat laudibus*, i.e. we have the familiar *pauidae natarunt dammae* and the equally familiar *superiecto natarunt aequore* set in combination. The effect may be very striking, as in such examples as *Odes* I. 3, 10, '*fragilem truci commisit pelago ratem*. But is

it quite just to say that such classifications are 'not very helpful to the understanding of the poet or his art,' when attention to such classifications does, unless I am mistaken, settle, once for all, the interpretation of passages like *Ephod.* 5, 19? H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

INTERLINEAR HIATUS IN HORACE.

PROFESSOR H. J. ROSE writes: 'In the article on the above subject, by Mr. Pritchard-Williams and myself, which appeared in the *C.R.* XXXVII., p. 113, attention should have been drawn to the article of Professor Postgate (Vol. XXXII., 1918, p. 23, *sqq.*) which discusses the whole question of the four-line stanza in Horace, with arguments drawn partly from neglect of synapheia. That this was not done is due purely to an oversight at the time of writing.'

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Abbott (F. F.) Our Debt to Greece and Rome. Roman Politics. Pp. vi + 177. London: Harrap, 1923. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Albertini (E.) Des Divisions administratives de l'Espagne romaine. Pp. vii + 138. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1923. Paper.
- Albertini (E.) La Composition dans les Ouvrages philosophiques de Sénèque. (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 127.) Pp. xi + 354. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1923. Paper.
- Asman (H. N.) An Introduction to the History of Rome. With 2 maps and 14 illustrations. Second edition, revised. Pp. ix + 180. London: Methuen, 1923. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Bailey (C.) The Legacy of Rome: Essays by C. Foligno, E. Barker, H. S. Jones, G. H. Stevenson, F. de Zulueta, H. Last, C. Bailey, C. Singer, J. W. Mackail, H. Bradley, G. M. Rushforth, G. Giovannoni, W. E. Heitland; edited by C. B. Pp. xii + 512. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Barone (N.) Paleografia Latina Diplomatica e Nozioni di Scienze Ausiliarie. Pp. 347. Atlante di Facsimili riprodotti in fotoincisione. XXVIII Tavole. (Biblioteca di MOYSEION, Vol. I.) Naples: Rondinella and Loffredo, 1923. The two together, L. 40. Paper.
- Barton (A. T.) The Sonnets of William Shakespeare, with a Latin translation by A. T. B. Pp. vii + 155. (The New Aldine Library, II.) London: Hopkinson, 1923. Boards, 18s.
- Bell (A. J.) The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction, Studies in Numbers and Figures. Pp. viii + 468. London: Milford, 1923. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Binns (L. E.) Erasmus the Reformer. Pp. xxii + 138. London: Methuen, 1923. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Bourgery (A.) Sénèque: Dialogues. Tome II.: De la Vie heureuse, De la Brièveté de la Vie. Texte établi et traduit par A. B. (Collection des Universités de France.) Pp. ii + 158. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 9 francs.
- Brenot (A.) Les Mots et Groupes iambiques réduits dans le Théâtre latin. Pp. xiv + 116. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, 239^{me} fascicule.) Paris: E. Champion, 1923. Paper.
- Classical Philology. Vol. XVIII., No. 3. July, 1923.
- Collingwood (R. G.) Roman Britain. Pp. 104. London: Milford, 1923. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Compton (W. C.) Caesar, Book III. of the Civil War, partly in the original and partly in F. P. Long's translation, edited by W. C. C. and C. E. Freeman, with an Introduction by H. Last. Pp. 160. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Cornford (F. M.) Greek Religious Thought from Homer to the Age of Alexander. (The Library of Greek Thought.) Pp. xxxv + 252. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent; New York: E. P. Dutton, 1923. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Coulon (V.) Aristophanes: Les Acharniens, Les Cavaliers, Les Nuées. Texte établi par V. C. et traduit par H. van Daele. (Collection des Universités de France.) Pp. xxxiii + 449. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 20 francs.
- Croiset (A.) Platon: Œuvres complètes. Tome III., 1^{re} partie: Protagoras. Texte établi et traduit par A. C. et L. Bodin. (Collection des Universités de France.) Pp. 153. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 9 francs.
- De la Harpe (J.) Étude sur *tamen*, Conjonction adversative, et son Passage au Sens causal,

- avec Remarques comparatives sur les Particules *sed, autem, nam, enim*. Pp. 114. Lausanne: Faculté des Lettres, 1923. Paper.
- Delatte* (A.) *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène-Laërce*, édition critique avec introduction et commentaire. Pp. 270. Brussels: M. Hayez, 1922. Paper.
- Diels* (H.) *T. Lucretius Carus de Rerum Natura*, lateinisch und deutsch von H. D. Band I.: T. L. C. de R. N. recensuit emendavit supplevit H. D. Pp. xlv + 410. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. Paper, 9s. 8d.
- Eberhard* (P. E.) *Das Schicksal als poetische Idee bei Homer*. Pp. 80. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XIII. Band; I. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1923. Paper.
- Eitrem* (S.) *Zu den Berliner Zauberpapyri*. (Videnskapsselskapets Forhandlinger for 1923. No. 1.) Pp. 15. Kristiania: J. Dybwad.
- Europa* (carmen praemio aureo donatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano). Accedunt quatuor carmina laudata. Amsterdam: Academia Regia Discipularum Nederlandica, 1923.
- Fitzhugh* (T.) *The Pyrrhic Accent and Rhythm of Latin and Keltic*. Pp. 24. Reprint from April, 1923, *Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia*.
- Forster Smith* (C.) *Thucydides*, with an English translation by C. F. S. Vol. IV. (Books VII. and VIII.) Pp. v + 459. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1923. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Hardy* (E. G.) *The Monumentum Ancyranum*, edited by E. G. H. Pp. 167. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Hude* (C.) *Aretaeus*, edidit C. H. Pp. xxv + 183. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, II.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Paper.
- Illinois Greek Club*. *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander*, with an English translation by members of the I. G. C. Pp. 532. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1923. Cloth, 10s. net.
- International Index to Periodicals*. Vol. XI., No. 1, March, 1923.
- Jaeger* (W.) *Aristoteles. Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*. Pp. 438. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. Paper, 9s. 8d.
- Jensen* (C.) *Philodemos über die Gedichte*, fünftes Buch. Griechischer Text mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen. Pp. xi + 188. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. Paper, 3s. 10d.
- Jones* (W. H. S.) *Hippocrates*, with an English translation by W. H. S. J. Vol. II. Pp. lxxvi + 336. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1923. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Kern* (O.) *Orphicorum Fragmenta collegit O. K.* Pp. x + 407. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922. Paper, 4s.
- Laurand* (L.) *Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines. Appendice I.: Les Sciences dans l'Antiquité*. Pp. 58. Paris: Picard, 1923. Paper, 5 francs.
- Le Marchant* (A.) *Greek Religion in the Time of Hesiod*. Pp. viii + 185. Manchester: Sherratt and Hughes, 1923. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Locock* (C. D.) *Thirty-two Passages from the Odyssey in English Rhymed Verse*, by C. D. L. Pp. 84. London: Allen and Unwin, 1923. Boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Long* (G.) *The Thoughts of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*, translated by G. L. Pp. 156. (The New Aldine Library, I.) London: Hopkinson, 1923. Boards, 10s. 6d. net.
- McCartney* (E. S.) *Our Debt to Greece and Rome. Warfare by Land and Sea*. Pp. xix + 206. London: Harrap, 1923. Cloth, 5s. net.
- McFayden* (D.) *The Rise of the Princes' Jurisdiction within the City of Rome*. (Reprinted from Washington University Studies, Vol. X., Humanistic Series, No. 2, pp. 181-264, 1923.)
- Marchant* (E. C.) *Xenophon, Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, with an English translation by E. C. M. Pp. xxix + 532. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1923. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Marouzeau* (J.) *Le Latin: Dix Causeries*. Pp. 278. Toulouse: E. Privat; Paris: H. Didier, 1923. Paper, 7 francs.
- Mayor* (H. B.) *Primer of Attic Greek*. Pp. viii + 112. London: Macmillan, 1923. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Meillet* (A.) *Les Origines Indo-Européennes des Mètres Grecs*. Pp. viii + 80. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1923. Paper.
- Moon* (R. O.) *Hippocrates and his Successors in Relation to the Philosophy of their Time*. Pp. xii + 171. London: Longmans, 1923. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Morris* (G. G.) and *Smale* (W. R.) *Passages of Unseen Translation from Latin and Greek Authors*, compiled by G. G. M. and W. R. S. Pp. xx + 312. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 6s. 6d.
- Oesterley* (W. O. E.) *The Sacred Dance, a study in comparative folklore*. Pp. xi + 234. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Orlando* (M.) *Spigolature Glottologiche. Quaderni Primo e Secondo*. Pp. 21, 88. Palermo: Casa Editrice 'L'Attualità,' 1922. Paper, 2,50 and 10 lire.
- Palaeographia Latina*, edited by W. M. Lindsay. Part II. Pp. 96, 3 plates. (St. Andrews University Publications, XVI.) London: Milford, 1923. Paper, 5s. net.
- Perret* (L.) *Les Inscriptions Romaines: Bibliographie pratique* par L. P., avec une préface de R. Cagnat. Pp. 42. (Nouvelle Collection à l'Usage des Classes, XXXIII.) Paris: Klincksieck, 1924 [sic]. Paper, 2,50 francs.
- Pope* (C. G.) and *Bradshaw* (T. E. J.) *Latin Unseens selected by C. G. P. and T. E. J. B.* Pp. 183. London: Longmans, 1923. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Reid* (J. S.) *Latin Passages for Practice in Translation at Sight*. New edition. Pp. iii + 111. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1923. Limp cloth.
- Reid* (J. S.) *Sir John Edwin Sandys*. Pp. 7. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. X.) London: Milford. Paper, 1s. net.

- Rivista Indo-greco-italica di Filologia-Lingua-Antichità.* Anno VII. (1923), Fascicolo I. e II. Naples.
- Rolfe** (J. C.) Our Debt to Greece and Rome. Cicero and his Influence. Pp. vii+176. London: Harrap, 1923. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Rudberg** (G.) Septuaginta - fragmente under den Papyri Osloenses. Mit 1 Tafel. Pp. 8. (Videnskapsselskapets Forhandlingar for 1923. No. 2.) Kristiania: Dybwad, 1923.
- Sanday** (W.) and **Turner** (C. H.). Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis, being the N.T. quotations in the Old-Latin version of 'Ελεγχος και Παρρησιή Ψευδωνιμου Γνωσεως, edited from the MSS. with introductions, apparatus, notes, and appendices. (Old - Latin Biblical Texts, No. VII.) Pp. clxxxviii + 311. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth.
- Schnabel** (P.) Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur. Pp. iv+275. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Paper.
- Schweizer - Sidler** (H.) Tacitus' Germania erläutert von H. S.-S., erneuert von E. Schwyzer. Achte Auflage (dritte der Neubearbeitung). Pp. xiv+164. Halle a.d.S.: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1923. Paper.
- Sheppard** (J. T.) The Cyclops freely translated and adapted for Performance in English from the Satyric Drama of Euripides. Pp. 27. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Paper, 1s. net.
- Sihler** (E. G.) From Augustus to Augustine, Essays and Studies dealing with the Contact and Conflict of Classic Paganism and Christianity. Pp. xi+335. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Smith** (D. E.) Our Debt to Greece and Rome. Mathematics. Introduction by Sir T. L. Heath. Pp. x+175. London: Harrap, 1923. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Smith** (R.) The Solution of the Homeric Question: the Original Iliad and its Successive Expansions. Pp. 22. London: Grafton and Co., 8, Coptic Street, W.C. 1, 1923. Paper, 2s.
- The American Journal of Philology.* Vol. XLIV. No. 3. Whole No. 175. July, August, September, 1923.
- The Cambridge Ancient History*, edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock. Vol. I.: Egypt and Babylonia to 1580 B.C. Pp. xxii+704. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 35s. net.
- The Claim of Antiquity*, with an Annotated List of Books for those who know neither Latin nor Greek. Revised edition. Pp. 30. London: Milford, 1923. 1s. net.
- The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. XI. Part 1 and 2. 1921 (1923).
- Thorndike** (L.) A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the first thirteen centuries of our era. 2 vols. Pp. xli+835, vii+1036. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. Cloth, \$10.
- Tillyard** (E. M. W.) The Hope Vases, a Catalogue and a Discussion of the Hope Collection of Greek Vases, with an Introduction on the History of the Collection and on late Attic and South Italian Vases. Pp. x+179. 43 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, £4 4s. net.
- Treston** (H. J.) Poine, a Study in Ancient Greek Blood - Vengeance. Pp. ix+427. London: Longmans, 1923. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Van Buren** (E. D.) Archaic Fictile Revetments in Sicily and Magna Graecia. Pp. xx+168, 19 plates. London: John Murray, 1923. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Van Hook** (La R.) Greek Life and Thought, a Portrayal of Greek Civilisation. Pp. xvi+329. New York: Columbia University Press, 1923. Cloth.
- Vessereau** (J.) L'Etna. Texte établi et traduit par J. V. (Collection des Universités de France.) Pp. xxxiv+124. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 9 francs.
- Viedebantt** (O.) Antike Gewichtsnormen und Münzfüsse. Pp. iv+166. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. Paper, 2s. 5d.
- Viereck** (P.) Griechische und griechisch-demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg im Elsass, herausgegeben von P. V. mit Beiträgen von W. Spiegelberg. Erster Band: Texte. Pp. xv+356. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. Paper, 9s. 8d.
- Vinogradoff** (Sir P.) Historical Jurisprudence. Introduction. Pp. 173. Oxford: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Vollmer** (F.) Poetae Latini Minores, edidit F. V. Vol. II. 2: Ovidi Nux, Consolatio ad Liuam, Priapea. Pp. i+80. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Paper, 1.60s.
- Waldis** (J.) Die Präpositions-Adverbien mit der Bedeutung 'vor' in der Septuaginta. Zur Syntax der Koine. Beilage zum Jahresbericht der Kantonsschule in Luzern, 1921-1922. Pp. 29. Lucerne: A. Bucher-Räber, 1922. Paper.
- Watts** (N. H.) Cicero, the Speeches pro Archia, post reditum in Senatu, post reditum ad Quintes, de domo sua, de haruspicum responsis, pro Plancio; with an English translation by N. H. W. Pp. vii+551. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1923. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Webster** (E. W.) The Works of Aristotle translated into English: Meteorologica. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Windle** (B. C. A.) The Romans in Britain. Pp. xii+244. London: Methuen, 1923. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Wright** (F. A.) The Arts in Greece: Three Essays. Pp. viii+111. London: Longmans, 1923. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Wright** (F. A.) The Girdle of Aphrodite: the complete love poems of the Palatine Anthology translated by F. A. W., with an introduction. Pp. xxxvii+316. London: G. Routledge; New York: E. P. Dutton. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Wright** (W. C.) The Works of the Emperor Julian, with an English translation by W. C. W. In three volumes. Vol. III. Pp. lxvii+448. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1923. Cloth, 10s. net.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Adcock (F. E.)**, notice of Photiades' *Ἀττικὸν Δίκαιον*, 140
- Aeschylus**, two problems in, 187
- Agam.* (40 sqq.), 104
- (42 sqq.), 23
- Septem c. Thebas* (101 sq.), 166
- Agamemnon** of Aeschylus, suggestions on the, 16
- 444, and a Galatian inscription, 55
- Agar (T. L.)**, suggestions on the **Agamemnon** of Aeschylus, 16
- Alexandrian poets, recent editions of the, 2
- Allbutt (Sir Clifford)**, notice of Taylor's *Greek Biology and Medicine*, and Singer's *Greek Biology and Greek Medicine*, 129
- Allen's (P. S. and A. M.) *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, Vol. IV., noticed, 125
- Allobroga, 60
- Anderson (J. G. C.)**, notice of Gsell's *Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie*, 174
- notice of Mattingly's *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, 175
- Appleton's *Ludi Persici*, noticed, 83
- Aristophanes, *Birds* (700), 113
- Frogs* (1203), 10
- Arnaldi's *Le Idee Politiche Morali e Religiose di Tacito*, noticed, 191
- Athena's temple at Lindos, chronicle of, 140
- Athenaeus, notes on, 114
- Atkinson (D.)**, notice of Henderson's *Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian*, 170
- notice of Boak's *History of Rome*, 171
- Bacchylides Papyrus, some notes on the, 148
- Bailey (C.)**, notice of Duff's *T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Liber Primus*, 119
- notice of Halliday's *Lectures on the History of Roman Religion*, 123
- notice of Pease's *Cicero : De Divinatione*, 311
- notice of Tromp's *De Romanorum Piaculis*, 81
- Bailey's *Lucreti de Rerum Natura libri sex*, noticed, 118
- Barber (E. A.)**, recent editions of the Alexandrian poets, 2
- Barnard's *A Fardel of Epigrams*, noticed, 168
- Baxter (J. H.)**, reminiscences of Plautus, 27
- Bell (H. I.)**, notice of Rostovtzeff's *A Large Estate in Egypt*, 32
- Beloch's *Griechische Geschichte*, Vol. III. : Part I., noticed, 80
- Benson's *The Reed of Pan*, noticed, 168
- Bidez and Cumont, *Imp. Caesaris Flavii Claudii Iuliani Epistulae Leges Poematia Fragmenta Varia*, noticed, 121
- Blakeney (E. H.)**, notices of schoolbooks, 83
- Blegen's *Korakow*, noticed, 71
- Boak's *History of Rome*, noticed, 171
- Boiotian League, further note on the, 63
- Bolkestein's *'Fabrieken' en 'Fabrikanten' in Griekenland*, noticed, 193
- Books Received, 47, 95, 143, 198
- Botsford's *Hellenic History*, noticed, 84
- Brakman (C.)**, the expression 'fons et origo,' 26
- Broadhead's *Latin Prose Rhythm*, noticed, 178
- Burnaby (J.)**, notice of *Chanties in Greek and Latin*, 189
- Butler's *Amaranth and Asphodel*, noticed, 168
- Cupid and Psyche* (Apuleius), noticed, 83
- Calder (W. M.)**, Aeschylus, *Agam.* (42 sqq.), 23
- Aeschylus, *Septem c. Thebas*, 166
- Agamemnon* 444 and a Galatian inscription, 55
- notice of Bidez and Cumont, *Imp. Caesaris Flavii Claudii Iuliani Epistulae Leges Poematia Fragmenta Varia*, 121
- notice of Jacks' *St. Basil and Greek Literature*, 185
- Ulpian and a Galatian inscription, 8
- Calder's *Togail na Tebe : The Thebaid of Statius*, noticed, 186
- Campbell (Sidney G.)**, notice of Conway's *The Making of Latin*, 127
- Carlsson's *Zur Textkritik der Pliniusbriefe*, noticed, 139
- Cary (M.)**, notice of Beloch's *Griechische Geschichte*, Vol. III., Part I., 80
- Catullus LXVI. (92 sqq.), 57
- Catullus, a translation from, 67
- two notes on, 25
- Cicero, *Ad Fam.* VII. (32), 64
- Cichorius, *Roemische Studien*, noticed, 34
- Clark (Albert C.)**, notice of Broadhead's *Latin Prose Rhythm*, 178
- Cleon and the Assembly, 165
- Clifton (E. W. V.)**, notice of Shotwell's *Introduction to the History of History*, 181
- Collingwood (R. G.)**, notice of Oswald and Pryce's *Introduction to the study of Terra Sigillata*, 137
- Conway (R. S.)**, a rejoinder to Mr. Lloyd James on *The Making of Latin*, 196
- Conway's *The Making of Latin*, noticed, 127
- Cookson (C.)**, notice of H. D. Naylor's *Horace, Odes and Epodes*, 28
- Cookson (G. M.)**, on translating Greek Tragedy, 146
- Cornford (F. M.)**, notice of Pringle-Pattison's *The Idea of Immortality*, 132
- CORRESPONDENCE, 47, 95, 195
- Cumont's *After Life in Roman Paganism*, noticed, 87
- Demosthenes and the Younger Pliny, notes on, 152
- Diogenes Laertius X. (60), 108
- Doëds (E. R.)**, notice of de Falco's (*Iamblich*) *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, 138
- Donovan's *Theory of Advanced Greek Composition*, noticed, 138
- Dornseiff's *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, noticed, 89
- Drachmann's *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*, noticed, 188
- dramatic technique of the *Oedipus Coloneus*, the, 50
- Drew (D. L.)**, 'ex pelle Herculem': Horace, *Odes* III. 3 (1 sqq.), 62
- Horace, *Epodes* V. (49 sqq.), 24
- Duff (J. D.)**, 'Let's talk of worms' (version), 97
- Duff (J. D.)**, notice of Bailey's *Lucreti de Rerum Natura libri sex*, 118
- Duff (J. Wight)**, notice of Arnaldi's *Le Idee Politiche Morali e Religiose di Tacito*, 191
- notice of Fort's *The Pervigilium Veneris in Quatrains*, 82
- notice of Galdi's *L'Epitome nella letteratura latina*, 189
- Duff's *T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Li Primus*, noticed, 119
- EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS, 1, 49, 98, 145
- Edmonds (J. M.)**, some notes on the great Bacchylides Papyrus, 148
- Eitrem (S.)**, *Venus Calva* and *Venus Cloacina*, 14
- Euripides and Tharyps, 58
- Evelyn-White (H. G.)**, Statius, *Silvae* I. praef. (37), 67
- 'ex pelle Herculem': Horace, *Odes* III. 3. (1 sqq.), 62
- Falco's [*Iamblich*] *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, noticed, 138
- Ferguson (A. S.)**, Stobaeus, *Eclogae* II. (vii.), 65
- 'fons et origo,' the expression, 26
- Forster (Edward S.)**, notice of Petrie's *Lycurgus : the Speech against Leocrates*, 76
- notice of Stocks' *De Caelo* and Joachim's *De Generatione et Corruptione (The Works of Aristotle translated into English; Clarendon Press)*, 44

- Forster (Edward S.)**, notice of Joachim's *Aristotle on 'Coming-to-be' and 'Passing-away'*, 44
- Fort's *The Pervigilium Veneris in Quatrains***, noticed, 82
- Fotheringham (J. K.)**, the probable error of a water-clock, 166
- Frank's *Vergil: A Biography***, noticed, 36
- Franklin's *The Lupercales***, noticed, 134
- Fraser (J.)**, notice of Calder's *Toga na Tebe: The Thebaid of Statius*, 186
- Frazer's *The Golden Bough*** (abridged edition), noticed, 83
- Freeman (Miss Kathleen)**, the dramatic technique of the *Oedipus Coloneus*, 50
- Freeman's *Scenes from the Trojan War***, noticed, 83
- Furness (Miss S. M. M.)**, notes on some passages of Lucretius (Book V.), 20
- Galdi's *L'Epitome nella letteratura latina***, noticed, 189
- Galletier's (P. Vergili Maronis) *Epigrammata et Priapea***, noticed, 88
- Gardner (Miss Alice)**, notice of Westaway's *The Educational Theory of Plutarch*, 43
- Gardner (P.)**, notice of Grose's *Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins: Vol. I.*, 177
- notice of Rostovtzeff's *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 78
- notice of Wright's *The Arts in Greece*, 191
- Garrod (H. W.)**, Locrica, 161
- Gaselee (S.)**, notice of the late A. S. Walpole's *Early Latin Hymns*, 136
- Gelenian Codices of Livy**, 115
- Gephart's *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Domitiani***, noticed, 140
- Glover's *A Child's Garden of Verses: done into Latin***, noticed, 168
- Goddard (E. H.)**, Propertius, Cynthia, and Augustus, 153
- Godley (A. D.)**, Some Translations, 167
- Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum: Vol. I.***, noticed, 192
- M. Porci Catonis de Agri Cultura Liber*, noticed, 89
- Gomme (A. W.)**, notice of Botsford's *Hellenic History*, 84
- Graffiti at Ostia**, 163
- Greek Tragedy**, on translating, 146
- Groeneboom's *Les Mimiambes d'Hérodas, I-VI.***, noticed, 38
- Grose's *Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins, Vol. I.***, noticed, 177
- Gsell's *Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie***, noticed, 174
- Gummere's *Seneca the Philosopher and his Modern Message***, noticed, 131
- Hall's *Caer Lingwy: the Roman Fort between Capel Curig and Bettws-y-Coed***, noticed, 186
- Halliday, Professor**, on 'The Origin of Tyranny,' 27
- Halliday (W. E.)**, *Herodas, Mimes III. (93)*, 115
- Mossynos and Mossynoikoi, 105
- notice of Cumont's *After Life in Roman Paganism*, 87
- notice of Drachmann's *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*, 188
- Halliday's *The Growth of the City State***, noticed, 169
- Lectures on the History of Roman Religion*, noticed, 123
- Harden's *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi***, noticed, 137
- Harrison (E.)**, *Aristophanes, Frogs (1203)*, 10
- 'Let us eat and drink' (version), 97
- Catullus LXVI. (92 sqq.)*, 57
- two Scandinavian Miscellanies, 182
- notice of Bolkestein's 'Fabrieken' en 'Fabrikanen' in Griekenland, 193
- notice of Rogers' *The Ecclesiastical of Aristophanes*, 192
- notice of Thorndike's *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 138
- Harrison (E.)**, Tacitus, *Annals, IV. (33)*, 22
- Headlam-Knox, Herodas: the Mimes and Fragments**, noticed, 39
- Heath (Sir T. L.)**, notice of Heiberg's *Mathematics and Physical Science in Classical Antiquity* (translated by D. C. Macgregor), 133
- Heath's *A History of Greek Mathematics***, noticed, 69
- Heiberg's *Mathematics and Physical Science in Classical Antiquity*** (translated by D. C. Macgregor), noticed, 133
- Heitland's *The Roman Fate***, noticed, 90
- Henderson's *Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian***, noticed, 170
- Herodas, Mimes III. (93)**, 115
- Herodotos and Westermarck**, 165
- Hicks (R. D.)**, *Diogenes Laertius, X. (60)*, 108
- notice of von der Muehl's *Epicuri epistulae ires et valae sententiae a Laertio Diogene servatae*, 133
- Hoernle's *The Problem of the Agamemnon***, noticed, 187
- The Recognition Scene in the Choephoroe*, noticed, *ibid.*
- Holleaux's *Rome, la Grèce, et les Monarchies hellénistiques***, noticed, 40
- Homeric Catalogue of Ships**, the, 27
- Hopfinger's *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae***, noticed, 188
- Horace, Epodes V. (49 sqq.)**, 24
- Epode XIII. (3)*, 104
- interlinear hiatus in, 198
- Odes I. 13 (15 sq.)*, 66
- Hosius' *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum libri IV. (ed. 2)***, noticed, 120
- Housman (A. E.)**, *Allobroga*, 60
- Horace, Epode XIII. (3)*, 104
- notice of Hosius' *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum libri IV. (second edition)*, 120
- Hudson-Williams (T.)**, notice of Sheppard's *The Pattern of the 'Iliad'*, 73
- Hunt (A. S.)**, notice of Preisigke's *Namenbuch*, 138
- Hyde's *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art***, noticed, 74
- interlinear hiatus in the *Odes of Horace*, 113
- Irvine's *KTHMA ES AEI***, noticed, 83
- Jacks' *St. Basil and Greek Literature***, noticed, 185
- James (A. Lloyd)**, letter on Professor Conway's *The Making of Latin*, 195
- Jespersen's *Language: its Nature, Development, and Origin***, noticed, 90
- Joachim's *De Generatione et Corruptione (The Works of Aristotle translated into English; Clarendon Press)***, noticed, 44
- Aristotle on 'Coming-to-be' and 'Passing-away.'* noticed, 45
- Julian (Camille)**, *Peculium*, 61
- Kunst's *Die Frauengestalten im Attischen Drama***, noticed, 75
- Leaf (Walter)**, the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, 27
- prehistoric Corinth, 65
- Lindsay (W. M.)**, on Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, Vol. I.*, 192
- Plautus and The Beggar's Opera*, 67
- Plant. Pseud. (1274)*, 27
- notice of Cichorius' *Römische Studien*, 34
- notice of Goetz's *M. Porci Catonis de Agri Cultura Liber*, 89
- Schiaparelli's *Raccolta di Documenti Latini***, noticed, 186
- Lindsay's *The Corpus Glossary and The Corpus, Epinal, Evfurl, and Leyden Glossaries***, noticed, 85
- Early Latin Verse*, noticed, 183
- Palaeographia Latina (Part I.)*, noticed, 135
- Litchfield (H. W.)**, note on Livy, 42 (35, 2), 167
- Livingstone (R. W.)**, notice of Kunst's *Die Frauengestalten im Attischen Drama*, 75
- notice of Mackail's *Virgil and his Meaning to the World of To-day*, 117

Livy,
Locric
Lowe

Lucas
Lucr
Lucr
Lucr
Lumb
Mack
For

Mack
Buc
Mack
To-a
Madel
Mair's
Mair's
Maret
Bou
Masso
Masso
Mathe
Matti
Mus
McKen

no

no

no

Merrill
Miller
Mills
Mooney
Mossy
Mount
to G
192
Murray
of

Myres
not

Naylor
rep
a

Naylor
Nicklin
Novu

79
Noek (A
'O ptya

Onions
Gloss
Leyde

Ostinel
Oswald
Terra

Ovid, t
Oxford
Park's

Pearson
Pease (J
Pease's

Peculium
Peet (T
Religi

Petch (J
not
L

- Livy, 42 (35, 2), note on, 167
 Locrica, 161
Lowe (E. A.), note on the genuineness of the new
 Plautus fragment, 24
 notice of Lindsay's *Palaeographia Latina*,
 Part I., 135
Lucas (F. L.), The Reverse of Aristotle, 98
 Lucretius, Book V., notes on, 20
 Lucretius V. (1009 sq.), 21
 Lucretius, the religion of, 149
 Lucretius and Cicero's verse, 115
Lumb (T. W.), notes on Athenaeus, 114
Macdonald (George), notice of Miller's *The Roman
 Fort at Balmuldy*, 31
Mackail (J. W.), notice of Royd's *The Eclogues,
 Bucolics, or Pastorals of Virgil*, 68
 Mackail's *Virgil and his Meaning to the World of
 To-day*, noticed, 116
 Madeley's *Noctes Latinae*, noticed, 83
 Mair's (A. W.) *Callimachus and Lycophron* (Loeb
 Series), noticed, 3 f.
 Mair's (G. R.) *Avatus* (Loeb Series), noticed, 4
Marrett (R. R.), notice of Frazer's *The Golden
 Bough* (abridged edition), 83
Masson (John), the religion of Lucretius, 149
 Masson's *Selections from the Georgics*, noticed, 83
 Matheson's *The Growth of Rome*, noticed, 91
 Mattingly's *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British
 Museum*, Vol. I., noticed, 175
McKenzie (E.), notice of Jespersen's *Language: Its
 Nature, Development, and Origin*, 90
 notice of Solmsen's *Indogermanische Eigen-
 namen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*, 90
 notice of Stoltz's *Geschichte der lateinischen
 Sprache*, 89
 notice of Vendryes' *Le Langage: Introduction
 linguistique à l'Histoire*, 90
 Merrill's *C. Plini Secundi Epistulae*, noticed, 35
 Miller's *The Roman Fort at Balmuldy*, noticed, 31
 Mills' *The Odes of Horace*, Englished, noticed, 168
Mooney (George W.), Lucretius V. (1009 sq.), 21
 Mossyns and Mossynoikoi, 105
Mountford (J. F.), notice of Wessner's supplement
 to Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, Vol. I.,
 192
Murray (Gilbert), notice of Groeneboom's *Les
 Mimiambes d'Hérodas* (I.-VI.), 38
 of Headlam-Knox, *Herodas: The Mimes and
 Fragments*, ib.
Myres (J. L.), notice of Blegen's *Korakou*, 71
 notice of Halliday's *The Growth of the City
 State*, 169
Naylor (H. Darnley), Quintilian on Latin word
 order, 156
 reply to Mr. Cookson's review of *Horace, Odes
 and Epodes*, 197
 Naylor's *Horace, Odes and Epodes*, noticed, 28
Nicklin (T.), notice of Wordsworth and White's
Novum Testamentum D.N.I.C. (Partis II., fasc. II.),
 79
Noek (A. D.), 'Ο μέγας Πάν τέθνηκε, 164
 'Ο μέγας Πάν τέθνηκε, 164
Onions (C. T.), notice of Lindsay's *The Corpus
 Glossary, and The Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt, and
 Leyden Glossaries*, 85
 Ostinelli, *Auxilia*, the, noticed, 186
 Oswald and Pryce's *Introduction to the Study of
 Terra Sigillata*, noticed, 137
 Ovid, the, of 'the new Plautus fragment,' 66
 Oxford Philological Society Reports, 91, 140
 Park's *The Plebs in Cicero's Day*, noticed, 91
Pearson (A. C.), Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* (40 sqq.), 104
Pease (Arthur Stanley), a noteworthy survival, 165
 Pease's *Cicero: De Divinatione*, noticed, 30
 Peculium, 61
Peet (T. E.), notice of Hopfner's *Fontes Historiae
 Religionis Aegyptiacae*, 188
Petch (J. A.), notice of Hall's *Caer Lluguy*, 186
 notice of Taylor's *The Roman Villa at North
 Leigh*, ib.
 Petrie's *Lycurgus: The Speech against Leocrates*,
 noticed, 76
 Pfeiffer's *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, no-
 ticed, 2
Kallimachosstudien, noticed, 2 f.
Phillimore (J. S.), a problem in Propertius, 61
 notice of Zander's *Phaedrus Solutus*, 41
 phonetics, correspondence on, 195
 Photiades' 'Ἀττικὸν Δίκαιον', noticed, 140
 Pignaniol's *Recherches sur les Jeux romains*, noticed,
 134
 Pindarica, 5
Plater (W. E.), notice of Harden's *Psalterium iuxta
 Hebraeos Hieronymi*, 137
 Platanauer's *Claudian*, noticed, 172
 Plautus and *The Beggar's Opera*, 67
 Plautus fragment, note on the genuineness of the
 new, 24
 Plautus, *Pseud.* (1274), 27
 reminiscences of, 27
 Pliny the Younger, and Apuleius, notes on, 107
Postgate (J. P.), a translation from Catullus, 67
 notice of Carlsson's *Zur Textkritik der Plinius-
 briefe*, 139
 notice of Galletier's (*P. Virgili Maronis*) *Epi-
 grammata et Priapea*, 88
 notice of Merrill's *C. Plini Secundi Epistulae*, 35
 notice of Platanauer's *Claudian*, 172
 Postgate's *Prosodia Latina*, noticed, 124
 Poynton's *Flosculi Latini*, noticed, 83
 prehistoric Corinth, 65
 Preisigke's *Namenbuch*, noticed, 138
 Pringle-Pattison's *The Idea of Immortality* (Gifford
 Lectures), noticed, 132
 Propertius, a problem in, 61
 Propertius, Cynthia, and Augustus, 153
 Quintilian on Latin word order, 156
 Reverse of Aristotle, the, 98
Richards (G. C.), notice of P. S. and H. M. Allen's
Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami
 (Vol. IV.), 125
 Sophocles, *Philocetes* (35), 23
Robertson (D. S.), Cleon and the Assembly, 165
 Euripides and Tharyps, 58
 Pindarica, 3
 notes on Demosthenes and the Younger Pliny,
 152
 notes on the Younger Pliny and Apuleius, 107
 notice of Hyde's *Olympic Victor Monuments and
 Greek Athletic Art*, 74
 Rogers' *The Ecclesiastical Aristophanes*, noticed, 192
Rose (H. J.), Herodotus and Westermarck, 165
 Horace, *Odes* I. 13 (15 sq.), 66
 the Speaking Stone, 162
 notice of Miss Franklin's *The Lupercales*, 134
 notice of Pignaniol's *Recherches sur les Jeux
 romains*, 134
Rose (H. J.) and H. Pritchard Williams, interlinear
 hiatus in the Odes of Horace, 113
 Rostovtzeff's *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*,
 noticed, 78
A Large Estate in Egypt, noticed, 32
 Rouse's *Chanties in Greek and Latin*, noticed, 189
 Royd's *The Eclogues, Bucolics, or Pastorals of Virgil*,
 noticed, 68
Saunders (Miss Catherine), the political sympathies
 of Servius Sulpicius Rufus, 110
 Schiaparelli's *Raccolta di Documenti Latini*, noticed,
 186
Scott (J. E.), notice of Donovan's *Theory of Advanced
 Greek Composition*, 138
Scott (W.), notice of Dornseiff's *Das Alphabet in
 Mystik und Magie*, 89
Sedgwick (W. B.), Lucretius and Cicero's verse, 115
 Servius Sulpicius Rufus, the political sympathies
 of, 110
Seymour (P. A.), further note on the Boiotian
 League, 63
 Sheppard's *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles*,
 noticed, 168

- Sheppard's, *The Pattern of the 'Iliad,'* noticed, 73
 Shotwell's *Introduction to the History of History,* noticed, 181
 Sinclair (T. A.), on Strabo XI. 8. 2 (p. 511), 159
 Singer's *Greek Biology and Greek Medicine,* noticed, 129
 Slater (D. A.), *Tages Etruscus,* 54
 the Ovid of 'the new Plautus fragment,' 66
 three cases of transposition, 19
 two notes on Catullus, 25
 Smith (J. A.), notice of Heath's *A History of Greek Mathematics,* 69
 Smyth (Austin), two problems in Aeschylus, 187
 Solmsen's *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel des Kulturgeschichte,* noticed, 90
 Sonnenschein (E. A.), notice of Lindsay's *Early Latin Verse,* 183
 notice of Postgate's *Prosodia Latina,* 124
 notice of Thomson's *The Rhythm of Speech,* 187
 Sophocles, *Philoctetes* (35), 23
 Souter (A.), the extent of territory belonging to cities in the Roman Empire, 115
 the Gelenian Codices of Livy, 115
 notice of Svennung's *Orosiana,* 139
 Speaking Stone, the, 162
 Statius, *Silvae I. praef.* (37), 67
 Stevenson (G. H.), notice of Gephart's *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Domitiani,* 140
 notice of Heitland's *The Roman Fate,* 90
 notice of Matheson's *The Growth of Rome,* 91
 notice of Miss Park's *The Plebs in Cicero's Day,* 91
 Stobaeus, *Eclogae II.* (vii.), 65
 Stocks' *De Caelo* (*The Works of Aristotle translated into English;* Clarendon Press), noticed, 44
 Stolz's *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache,* noticed, 89
 Strabo (XI. 8. 2, p. 511), 159
 Sirena *Philologica Upsaliensis,* noticed, 182
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS: 45, 92, 141, 193
 Summers (Walter C.), notice of Gummere's *Seneca: the Philosopher and his Modern Message,* 131
 survival, a noteworthy, 165
 Svennung's *Orosiana,* noticed, 139
Symbolae Arctoe: Fasc. I., noticed, 182
 Tacitus, *Annals IV.* (33), 22
- 'Tages Etruscus,' 54
 Tarn (W. W.), notice of Holleaux' *Rome, la Grèce, et les Monarchies hellénistiques,* 40
 Tarrant (Miss Dorothy), Aristophanes, *Birds* (700), 113
 Taylor's *Greek Biology and Medicine,* noticed, 129
 The Roman Villa at North Leigh, noticed, 186
 territory belonging to cities in the Roman Empire, the extent of, 115
 Themistocles, Aeschylus and Diodorus, 64
 Thomson's *The Rhythm of Speech,* noticed, 187
 Thorndike's *A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the First Thirteen Centuries of our Era,* noticed, 138
 Timachidas of Lindos, 140
 translations, two, 97
 transposition, three cases of, 19
 Trevelyan's *The Oresteia of Aeschylus,* noticed, 168
 Tromp's *De Romanorum Piaculis,* noticed, 81
 Ulpian and a Galatian inscription, 8
 Ure (P. N.), Professor Halliday on 'The Origin of Tyranny,' 27
 Themistocles, Aeschylus, and Diodorus, 64
 Van Buren (A. W.), *Graffiti at Ostia,* 163
 Vendryes' *Le Langage: Introduction linguistique à l'Histoire,* noticed, 90
Venus Calva and Venus Cloacina, 14
 Von der Muehl's *Epicuri epistolae tres et vates sententiae a Laertio Diogene servatae,* noticed, 133
 Walpole's *Early Latin Hymns,* noticed, 136
 Warren (Herbert), notice of Frank's *Vergil: a Biography,* 36
 water-clock, the probable error of a, 166
 Way's *The Odes of Pindar in English Verse,* noticed, 167
 Wessner's *De Lindsayi ejusque discipulorum studiis glossographicis,* noticed, 192
 Westaway's *The Educational Theory of Plutarch,* noticed, 43
 Whibley (Leonard), Cicero, *Ad Fam. VII.* (32), 64
 Wordsworth and White's *Novum Testamentum D.N.I.C. (Partis II., fasc. II.),* noticed, 79
 Wright's *The Arts in Greece,* noticed, 191
 Zander's *Phaedrus Solutus,* noticed, 41

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

- Aeschylus:—*Agam.* (40 sqq.), 104 (42 sqq.), 23a, b; (131, 239, 287), 16a; (444) 55 ff.; (496, 555), 16b; (569, 746, 805), 17a; (948, 1055), 17b; (1058, 1252, 1299), 18a; (1641, 1693), 18b.
Septem c. Thebas (101 sq.), 166a.
 Apuleius;—*Metam. VI.* (22), 107b; VIII. (8), 108
 Aristophanes:—*Birds* (700), 113a
 Frogs (1208), 10 ff.
 Aristotle:—*ap. Plutarch, Cleomenes* (9), 15b
 Poetics: (1452a, 12 sqq., 22 sq.; 1450a, 33 sqq.; 1456a, 19 sqq.; 1454b, 14, 29 sq.; 9) 99a
 Athenaeus:—(14 C, 32 C, 238 E, 258 A), 114; (345 E), 105; (605 F), 115a
 Augustine:—*De Civ. Dei III.* (15), 115b
 Bacchylides:—*Fr. 9, 14* (Kenyon), 149; 29, 20 (35), 148
 Boethius:—*Consol. Philos. IV.* (vi. 36), 26b
 Callimachus:—*Epigr. XXXIX.* 5, XLVII. 7 (A. P.), 3b
 frag. 115 (Schneider), 2b; *Cydippe* (Pfeiffer), 4a
 Hymns I. 42, II. 26 sq., III. 114, 121, 124, V. (93), 3b
 pap. Berol. 13417 A, 2b; 11521, 11629 B, 3a
 pap. Oxyrh. 1011, II. 36 sqq., 81 sqq., 218 sq., 2b; XI. (1362), 3a
 Catullus:—VIII. (15), 19b
 LXIII. (14), 25b
 LXIV (135), 26a
 LXVI. (92 sqq.), 57 f.
 Demosthenes:—*Adv. Polyclem. L.* (36), 152a
 Contra Cononem LIV. (26), 153a
 Pro Phormione, XXXVI. (8), 152a
 Diogenes Laertius:—X. (60), 108 ff.
 Herodas:—III. (93), 115a; IV. (*passim*), 39 f.
 Herodotus:—IV. (189), 165
 Horace:—*Epodes V.* (49 sqq.), 24 f.; XIII. (3), 104
 Odes I. 13 (15 sqq.), 66b; III. 3 (1 sqq.), 62
 Livy:—42 (35, 2) 167
 Lucretius:—V. (294 sqq., 948 sqq.), 20 f.; (1009 sq.), 21a
 Ovid:—*Met.* ii. (454 sqq.), 19
 Phaedrus:—II. 5; XI.; XII. (Zander); XVII. 9; XVIII. 2, 17; XX., 42 f.
 Pindar:—*Nem.* II. (10 sqq.), 5; III. (34), 6; IX. (22), 6 f.
 Plantus:—*Captivi* (32), 27a
 Pseud. (1274), ib.
 Pliny the Younger:—*Epist. IV.* 41 (6), 35b; VIII. 23 (8), 153b
 Panegy. 75. 6, 90 (6), 107a
 Plutarch:—*Nicias* (7), 165a
 Properitius:—II. iii. (27), 61 f.; II. (vii.), 154 f.; III. v., 18; IV. iii. (11), 61 f.
 Prudentius:—*Contra Symmachium I.* (72), 26b
 Hamartig. (556), ib.
 Quintilian:—VII. 9 (2 sqq.), 158a; (8), 159b.
 VIII. 2 (14), 158a; 4 (8), 158b; 6 (40), 158b; (6a, 65), 157b. IX. 3 (34), 159a; 4 (23, 24), 156; (26, 28, 31), 157; (68, 92), 159b
 Servius:—*ad Aen. I.* (720), 15a
 Sophocles:—*Philoct.* (35), 23
 Statius:—*Silvae I. Praef.* (37), 20, 67a
 Stobaeus:—*Eclogae II.* (vii.), 65a
 Strabo:—XI. 8. 2 (p. 511), 159 f.
 Tacitus:—*Annals IV.* (33), 22

Grice,

(700).

129

186

pire,

mental

Era,

168

in of

64

que à

rales

ticed,

il: a

ticed,

studii

tarch,

, 64

entum

, 104

sq.).

II. 9;

; IX.

VIII.

64 f.;

159b.

; (6a.

; (26.

FROM MR. MURRAY'S LIST

STUDIES IN ENGLISH RHYMES FROM SURREY TO POPE

A Chapter in the History of English. By HENRY CECIL WYLD, Author of 'The Historical Study of the Mother Tongue,' etc. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

THE MAKING OF LATIN

By R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester; Hon. Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

NEW STUDIES OF A GREAT INHERITANCE

Being Lectures on the Modern Worth of some Ancient Authors. By R. S. CONWAY, F.B.A., Litt.D., Hulme Professor of Latin in the Victoria University of Manchester. 7s. 6d. net.

VIRGIL'S MESSIANIC ECLOGUE

Its Meaning, Occasion and Sources. Three Studies by the Rev. JOSEPH B. MAYOR, W. WARDE FOWLER, and Prof. R. S. CONWAY. With the Text of the Eclogue and a Verse Translation by Prof. R. S. CONWAY. 3s. 6d. net.

LATIN LITERATURE

By J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D., formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 5s. net.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER

Translated into English Verse by J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D. Vol. I. (Books I.-VIII.). Vol. II. (Books IX.-XVI.). Vol. III. (Books XVII.-XXIV.). 6s. net each volume.

ON TRANSLATING HOMER

By MATTHEW ARNOLD. With Introduction and Notes by W. H. D. ROUSE, M.A., Litt.D. 3s. 6d. net.

THE GREEK THINKERS

A History of Ancient Philosophy. By THEODOR COMPERZ. Vol. I. translated by Laurie Magnus, M.A. Vols. II., III., and IV. translated by G. G. Berry, M.A. Four Volumes. 21s. net each.

HERODOTUS

The Text of Canon Rawlinson's Translation. With the Notes abridged for the use of Students. By A. J. GRANT, M.A., Professor of History in the University of Leeds. With Maps and Plans. Two Volumes. 18s. net.

THE ANNALS OF TACITUS

For English Readers. An English Translation with Introduction and Notes. By GEORGE G. RAMSAY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., formerly Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow. Two Volumes. 18s. net each.

THE HISTORIES OF TACITUS

An English Translation. By GEORGE G. RAMSAY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., formerly Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow. With Introduction, Frontispiece, Notes, Maps and Index. 18s. net.

A HISTORY OF GREECE

From the Earliest Period to the Death of Alexander the Great. By GEORGE GROTE. With Portrait, Maps and Plans. Ten Volumes. 43s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

THE CLARENDON Latin and Greek Series

Partly in the Original and partly in Translation. Edited by R. W. Livingstone. With Introductions, Notes, and Vocabularies.

'THIS excellent series of the School Classics in alternate passages of original text and translation . . . 'A method which most people will prefer to the more usual device of giving only selected passages or scenes.'—*The Times Educational Supplement*.

'An interesting experiment.'—*The Journal of Education*.

'A very useful series.'—*The Educational Times*.

'The idea is new and excellent. Under our present system of slow plodding at school the student is particularly gifted if he sees the wood for the trees. This book makes a start in the right direction.'—*The Oxford Magazine*.

'The experiment is a good one and will doubtless be extended to other authors.'—*The Classical Review*.

The following volumes are ready, at 3/6 net each :

AESCHYLUS, PERSAE. Edited by M. R. RIDLEY.

APULEIUS, CUPID & PSYCHE. Edited by H. E. BUTLER.

ARISTOPHANES, CLOUDS. Edited by CYRIL BAILEY.

CAESAR, CIVIL WAR, I-II. Edited by H. N. P. SLOMAN.

CAESAR, CIVIL WAR, III. Edited by W. C. COMPTON,
H. M. LAST and C. E. FREEMAN.

CAESAR, GALLIC WAR, IV (20-38) and V. Edited by
R. W. LIVINGSTONE and C. E. FREEMAN. 3s. net.

CAESAR, GALLIC WAR, VI-VII. Edited by the same.

THE CATILINARIAN CONSPIRACY from Sallust and
Cicero. Edited by H. E. BUTLER.

EURIPIDES, THE MEDEA. Edited by F. L. LUCAS.

HERODOTUS, BOOK VII. Edited by C. E. ROBINSON and
others.

SALLUST, THE JUGURTHINE WAR. Edited by H. E.
BUTLER.

VIRGIL, AENEID I-III. Edited by C. E. FREEMAN and
CYRIL BAILEY.

VIRGIL, AENEID IV-VI. Edited by CYRIL ALINGTON.

THE MARTYRDOM OF SOCRATES. From the *Apology*,
Crito, and *Phaedo*. Edited by F. C. DOHERTY.

CICERO, THE ADVOCATE, being Cicero *Pro Milone* and
Pro Murena. Edited by C. COOKSON.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

HUMPHREY MILFORD.

AMEN CORNER, LONDON, E.C. 4

